SRI SANKARA'S GITA BHASHYA

(Sri Sankaracharya's Commentary on the *Gita*)

Translation by
C. V. RAMACHANDRA AIYAR

Foreword by
SWAMI RANGANATHANANDA

1989
BHARATIYA VIDYA BHAVAN
Kulapati K. M. Munshi Marg
Bombay 400 007

First Edition : 1988
Second Edition : 1989

PRINTED IN INDIA

By C. T. Nachiappan, at Kalakshetra Publications, Kalakshetra Road, Thiruvanmiyur, Madras-600 041, and Published by S. Ramakrishnan, Executive Secretary, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Kulapati Munshi Marg, Bombay-400 007.

DEDICATION

To Bhagavān Śrī Rāmakṛṣṇa, the Supreme Teacher of all mankind, who, ever intent on its liberation, gave out the *Gītā* in His former incarnation as Bhagavān Śrī Kṛṣṇa

ॐ

॥ वन्दनम् ॥

शंकरं शंकराचार्यं श्रीपतिं पार्थसारथिम् ।
गीता-भाष्यकृतौ वन्दे भगवन्तौ पुनः पुनः ॥

VANDANAM

Śaṅkaram Śaṅkarācāryam Śripatim Pārthasārathim
Gītā-Bhāṣya-kṛtau vande Bhagavantau punaḥ punaḥ

OBEISANCE

I bow again and again

to the two Divine Personages—

Śaṅkarācārya, who is (none else than Śiva) as Śaṅkara (the Bestower of Felicity)

and

(Kṛṣṇa as) Pārthasārathi (the charioteer of Arjuna[1]), who is (none else than Viṣṇu,) the Lord of Śrī[2]—the authors (respectively) of the Commentary (*Bhāṣya*) and the (Original) *Gītā*.

1. Śrī Kṛṣṇa delivered the *Gītā* to Arjuna, while acting as his charioteer on the battle-field.

2. Lakṣmi, the Goddess of Beauty and Plenty, the Cousort of Viṣṇu.

FOREWORD

I have been requested by Sri T. Sadasivam to write a Foreword to the late Sri C. V. Ramachandra Ayyar's book : *Sri Sunkara's Gita Bhashya*; and I am glad to do so.

The book is an English translation of Adi Sankaracharya's famous commentary on the Srimad Bhagavad-Gita. This great book was for long centuries lying hidden in the immense literature of the Mahabharata epic. It was the great Sankaracharya who brought it out of that obscurity, wrote his famous commentary on it, and placed it before the people at large for their philosophical and spiritual guidance. Since then, it has been commented upon by many succeeding acharyas and scholars, medieval and modern. It has now become accepted as the most popular book on Sanatana Dharma and practical Vedanta. Sankaracharya's Introduction to his Gita Commentary is a masterpiece of Sanskrit prose, expounding the wide scope of the Vedic philosophy embracing the material and spiritual welfare of all humanity and the purpose of the Sri Krishna incarnation as the expounding of that comprehensive philosophy and spirituality known as Yoga.

Since the first English translation of Sankara's Gita Commentary by Mahadeva Sastry was published a little less than a century ago, several other translations have appeared and have found welcome by the reading public. There is growing interest in the Gita all over the world. In that context, the publication, by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, of this new traslation by Sri C. V. Ramachandra Ayyar is welcome; his rendering is lucid and his notes illumine the text of the commentary. I hope this book will have a wide circulation.

RANGANATHANANDA

Ramakrishna Math
Hyderabad-500 029.
3rd Febrary*l* 1988.

PUBLISHERS' PREFACE

Srimad Bhagavad Gita, the Song Celestial, which forms one of the triple basic texts, *Prasthanathrayi* of *Vedanta* philosophy, along with the *Upanishads* and the *Brahmasutras*, occupies a pre-eminent place among the sacred books of the world. Its uniqueness, as the world is slowly coming to realise, is that it is a devotional work to those who are imbued with *bhakti*, a philosophical treatise to those who have the aptitude to become *jnanis* and a practical guide to action to those who have evolved themselves as *Karmayogis*. Thus, its distilled wisdom is of great value to the yogi as to the simple householder alike.

The teachings of a master-mind call for another master-mind to interpret them for the benefit of the common man. Who else other than the greatest embodiment of *jnana* and *bhakti* the world has ever seen, Adi Sankara Bhagavadpada, is better qualified to write the commentary on the Gita! Many are the commentaries written on Bhagavad Gita by great sages and saints, both before and after Adi Sankara, but Sri Bhagavadapada's *Gita Bhashya* is in a class by itself and has stood the test of time.

The venerable Shri C. V. Ramachandra Ayyar, ripe in age and wisdom, devoted the last years of his life to translating Sri Bhagavadpada's *Gita Bhashya* from the original Sanskrit into English. Though some English translations of Sri Bhagavadpada's *Gita Bhashya* have appeared, this excellent translation and lucid commentary by Sri Ramachandra Ayyar is a welcome addition. Posterity owes a deep debt of gratitude to this great savant.

Sri Ra Ganapati, the *bhakti*-soaked devoted son of the great-scholar-father, spared no pains to make the book ready for publication, and the unique and generous Sadasivam Dampati, ever ready to extend their helping hand for all noble causes, came forward with financial and other assistance to make this publication possible.

The Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan is beholden to the Sadasivam Dampati and considers itself privileged to play its humble part in bringing out this monumental work of a dedicated savant. We hope that this book will nurture ethical and spiritual values in the present society, buffeted by materialistic trends, and also will attract lovers of Vedanta.

R. R. DIWAKAR
S. RAMAKRISHNAN
General Editors

PRESENTATION

Bowing down to the Gitacharya and Sankaracharya I carry out the holy and pleasant duty of presenting this book to the readers, a duty that the devolved upon me as the son of the translator Sri C. V. Ramachandra Aiyar of sacred memory.

C. V. R. Aiyar (1905-1979) came of a pious and erudite family of the temple-town Chidambaram. Right from his early years he began imbibing devotion to the Kula-Devata, the Divine Mother, knowledge of our scriptural lore and *sraddha* in religious observances at the feet of his rshi-like uncle, Sri Doraiswami Aiyar. At the time he finished schooling the family faced a rude economic set-back and he had to get admitted into the Sri Ramakrishna Mission Students' Home, which provided free board and lodging to deserving boys, when he began his collegiate education in the Presidency College, Madras.

It was a blessing in disguise. For it brought C. V. R. under the inspiring tutelage of Sri N. Subramania Aiyar, affectionately called "Anna" (elder brother), who was later to become not only the President of the R. K. MIssion Home, but also one of the respected spiritual illuminati of Tamilnadu. As a further stroke of divine luck during his days in the Home, C. V. R. had the great good fortune of rendering service to Pujya Sri Swami Brahmananda, the 'Spiritual Son' of Sri Ramakrishna, when he sojourned in Madras. Out of the abundance of his heart the Swami gave *diksha* to the *sraddha*-imbued young C.V.R.—a fact which the latter never divulged but came to light through "Anna". His deep devotion to the Paramahamsa and the Holy Mother gave a refreshing catholic touch to his strict Conformism, which naturally led him to hold Sri Sankara Bhagavadpada, the doughty upholder of the Vedic Tradition, in the highest esteem. This Ganga-Yamuna confluence in C.V.R. is brought to the fore by the present volume itself—a rendering of the Bhashya of the Bhagavadpada dedicated to the Paramahamsa.

As the years rolled on, C.V.R. intensified his *upasana* and continued extending the horizons of his spiritual scholarship. Gaining mastery in Vedanta and Mantra-sastra he took a share

in many of Anna's scriptural classics in Tamil—in jealously guarded anonymity.

Though *Bhakti-upasana* through *puja* and *japa* was his main *Sadhana*, he was an *advaitin* by conviction. And conviction consummated into flashes, at least, of Realisation under the benign influence of Sri Ramana Maharshi, whom he revered as one of his gurus.

On the secular side C.V.R. took his B.A. degree with Honours in Mathematics when he was barely nineteen and immediately entered government service. But his heart was not in it. Though he brought to bear his characteristic thoroughness in the official assignments that fell to his lot, he did not care to take the departmental tests for promotion, with the result that when he retired after thirty-six years of loyal service he had not risen above the rank of Tahsildar! If at all he stuck on to professional career it was because of the heavy responsibilities he had to shoulder as the eldest among seven offspring of an economically shaken family. He did acquit himself well in discharging the duty cast upon him, and the family ever remained g;ateful to him. On the domestic front he was blessed with a noble wife, a real *saha-dharma-charini*, who, in spite of her very poor health, ably and heartily carried out the heavy chores that housekeeping for an orthodox Brahmin, given to elaborate rituals, entails. Her poor health was, again, a blessing in disguise to C.V.R., helping him to lead an immaculately continent life right from his thirtieth year, which beside contributing to his spiritual sadhana, also sharpened his intellect. Absolutely honest and guileless, 'allergic' to public gaze, uncompromising in principles, unknown to mincing words, assiduous in whatever he did, this stickler for frugality and simplicity was forbiddingly reserved, and, to add to the forbidding aspect, was quick-tempered. If, in spite of this, he commanded nothing but love and respect from all who knew him, that surely is a mark of the intrinsic power of the purity of heart.

On retirement, which he was eagerly looking forward to, he plunged into what his heart was athirst for—puncitilious Devi Puja and in-depth study of the *Mantra-sastra*. He devoutly attached himself to the Sage of Kanchi, His Holiness the Paramacharya, for enlightenment on many abstruse and intricate points.

The Sage always had a softer corner in his soft heart for this sincere sanatanist-*sadhaka*, and however big the crowds around him, never disappointed the disciple without a very private audience and ever enthused him with the illumination he sought from the venerable Gurudeva. In his last years C.V.R. was also drawn in profund devotion to Sri Satya Sai Baba. It is moving to think of his very last moments on earth—On the forenoon of that *sravana purnima*, a fully conscious and meditative C.V.R. was gracefully slipping out of the body. Quite unexpectedly the *vibhuti* of the Baba arrived at the nick of time. C.V.R. had it smeared on his forehead and chest and a pinch placed on his tongue. He raised up his hands to fold the palms up above his head. With that lfinal act of supreme thanks giving ended in natural ease a life of ife-long prayer.

From the story of the Translator to the story of the Translation:

Years back, 'Anna' was apprised of the interest of a certain religious institution in bringing out an English translation of the Sanskrit Commentary of Sri Sankara Bhagavadpada on the *Bhagvad-Gita*. Immediately he thought of C.V.R. and entrusted the difficult task to him. C.V.R. set himself to the *punya kainkarya* heart and soul and working on it for months brought out the finished product. 'Anna' sent it to the veteran Professor of Philosophy, Sri P. Sankaranarayanan for comments. Sri P. S. was all praise for the translation and recommended it for publication without any correction or touching up. But, unfortunately, the expected publishing arrangement fell through. Though he had undertaken a rigorous *tapasya* over the work, C.V.R. was least worried about its publication! He had carried out the behest of his Guru, 'Anna', and there the matter ended for him! He passed away in 1979, nine years before his monumental labour of love was to see the light of the day. The *lila* of the Lord is inscrutable!

I could have struck upon the present publishing arrangement through the god-parenting of the *Kalpataru-dampati*, Sri T. Sadasivam and Smt. M. S. Subbulakshmi, even while my father was alive. But I purposely kept back because of my knowledge that *this* Kalpataru is not one overladen with fruits which it could easily dispense with as soon as one comes under it, but one that has itself to strike newer roots to tap the resources to produce the fruit needed by the new-comer! To put it factually—a fact that

may sound like fiction—this renowned Benefactor-Couple have never cared to build up any large savings out of which to draw upon when a call comes for help. As no less a person than the Sage of Kanchi once said, they do not give out of what they have got, but they set out to get in order to give! The beauty of it is, that in this way they have been helping cause after worthy cause as not even *crore-patis* can do! Once they feel a cause worthy of their god-parenting, either M.S. offers her golden voice to bring in the needed shower of gold, or T. S. addresses himself to the delicate task of calling upon the liberality of his affluent friends, or both. As I did not want them to take the trouble involved, I scrupulously avoided telling them about my father's unpublished manuscript for over a decade. But in His inscrutable *lila*, some months back I found myself blurting out the 'secret' to them. Perhaps it was His will that the book must come out only during the grand celebration of the 1200th *jayanti* of the great Bhashyakara! At once, and with the utmost warmth, the Sadasivams became the godparents of the project and began nourishing it as they would a pet child!

It was but the spontaneous expression of not only their devotion to the Gitacharya and the Bhashyakara but also their genuine regard for my father and affectionate love for me. Unburdening me of any the least responsibility and absolving me of derelication of filial duty, Sri Sadasivam 'made over' the project to himself and with his characteristic thoroughness attended to every little detail of its planning and execution. In particular, he arranged for the free supply of the paper and the printing of the book at modest charges, and as I am writing this, is busy planning the Release, What an ambrosial nourishment for this *Gita*-child to have the *Sangita* of Mother Subbulakshmi bring in the entire resources for the printing! Thanks giving being impossible, I pray with all my heart that this blessed-and-blessing *Dampati* are ever in the shower of the Bliss Supernal!

My very grateful thanks are due to Sri Ganga Prasad Birlaji for his generous and prompt gift of the entire bulk of paper needed for the book.

I owe a deep debt of gratitude to Sri C. T. Nachiappan of the Kalakshetra Publications, not only for the nice printing, but also for his personal involvement in the publication, which he under-

took not as a business proposition but as an opportunity for being of some help to the Sadasivams.

It is in the fitness of things that this great spiritual treasure of Bharat is published by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, one of the foremost institutions dedicated to the dissemination of our cultural legacy to the world at large. I thank the Bhavan, and in particular, its energetic Executive Secretary Sri S. Ramakrishnana, who has evinced a keen interest in the shaping of the book.

My affectionate thanks are due to artist ' Vinu ' for his beautiful wrapper design and frontispiece, and to Sri S. Mohanaraman for his diligent preparation of the typescripts.

May the blessings of Sri Krishna, the Avatar of Vishnu, who delivered the *Gita*, and of Sri Sankara, the Avatar of Siva, who elucidated it, ever be on all those connected with the publication and on all the readers!

Madras
24-2-1988.

RA. GANAPATI.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

The scheme adopted in this book is to give, first, the Sanskrit text of each of the verses of the *Bhagavad-Gitā* in the Devanāgari script; second, its transliteration; third, its bare literal translation; and fourth and last, the translation of Sri Sankarācārya's Sanskrit Bhāsya (Commentary) on it, which, often develops into discussions on various points touching the teaching—mostly by way of raising the *prima facie* view of the opponent (*pūrva-pakṣa*) and then critically analysing and refuting it to establish the final and settled conclusion of the proponent (*siddhānta*).

In this English rendering, utmost attention has been given to closely follow both the interpretation and structure of the original *Bhāsya.* In particular, it is made in such a way, that to the maximum possible extent it incorporates within it the phrases of the bare translation of the verses in their syntactical order in English. That is, the words and phrases of the bare verse-translation are interspersed in the translation of the *Bhāsya* in the same structural order. To make this clear to the reader, the words occurring in the bare verse-translation are italicised when incorporated in the Commentary portion. Because of this, words (like those in Sanskrit, which would otherwise be talicised are given fin the Roman type itself in that portion of the Commentary which incorporates words of the bare verse-translation. But in the Chapter-Introductions and those portions of the discussions which come after the complete incorporation of all the words of the bare verse-translation, the usual rules of talicising are followed.

As for the transliteration of the verses, it strictly conforms to the literal structure of the original in Devanāgari script. Yet, to facilitate easier reading and understanding, compound words have been split, as far as possible, into their constituent words by hyphenation—to the extent of separating the first constituent word by hyphen even when its last letter undergoes a change, e.g., *yat* changing into *yad* and *yaj* in IX.27 ; but when both the last letter of the first constituent and the first letter of the second constituent undergo changes they are not separated by hyphenation, e.g. *tacchṛṇu* (VII.1), compounded of *tat* and *Śṛṇu,* is given as a single

word and not separated by hyphen as *tac-chṛnu*. Also, capitals, for proper names in the second or further constiuents have been dispensed with in such unsplit compounds, e.g., Arjuna without capital A in *Bhimārjuna* (I.4).

* * *

Clarification of and further information on many points in the *Bhāsya* are given in the foot-notes, mostly by quoting from *Sri Gitā Bhāsya Iikā*, the erudite gloss of Sri Anandagiri (Circa 13th cent.) on the *Bhāsya* of Acārya Sankara.

* * *

The Acārya has not commented on the First Chapter and upto verse 10 of the Second Chapter, since this portion is just a prelude to the Lord's Teaching, which commences only in verse 11 of the Second Chapter. The Introduction (pp 1-6) is, of course, by the Acārya.

The customary *Dhyāna-slokas* are given immediately before beginning the *Bhāsya*.

* * *

It is fully realised that the translation cannot be perfect, consequent on the inherent difficulty in rendering a classical work into a modern language such as English. Moreover, the *Bhāsya* is so vast and profund that, every time one studies it, newer shades of meaning and newer approaches to the interpretations of the language used cannot fail to reveal themselves. It is nevertheless hoped that the version in its present form brings out the teaching of the Gitācārya, Sri Kṛsna and the Bhāsya-kāra, Sri Sankara with a reasonable degree of accuracy, as the translator feels that he has had their guidance as his inner light in some measure. Shortcomings in understanding the text and expressing the meaning in English, due to defect in the human intellect and power of expression, there surely must be; and the translator will feel highly grateful if learned readers will be good enough to bring errors and defects to notice.

It is felt that no apology is needed for making the translation rather literal, as the intention is that even the reader with only an

elementary knowledge of Sanskrit should be induced to study the original Bhāsya text also side by side, and be enabled to understand and appreciate it. The translator prays to Sri Rāmakṛṣṇa, to whom this work is dedicated in humble devotion, that He would give His blessings to the fulfilment of this wish.

* * *

Nowadays it is held by a considerable segment of the scholars (some of them also claiming allegiance to the Acārya's doctrine of Advaita) that the Path to Perfection/Liberation as established in the *Gītā* is one of eclecticism, advocating activity (Karma), performed in a spirit of devotion to God (Bhakti), and based on and guided by Knowledge (Jñāna). That is to say, the Path combines together Action and Knowledge (while also incidentally enfolding devotion). According to this interpretation the Knowledge-based Activity must be practised by the spiritual aspirant right upto Liberation, without his ever having to embrace the *saṁnyāsin's* life of complete renunciation of works.

Contrary to this assessment,the Ācārya has, in his *Bhāṣya*, interpreted the *Gītā* as laying down the Path of Action and the Path of Knowledge as two distinctly different courses, never to be combined, each of them being meant for people of a particular level of evolution. The Path of Knowledge demanding the total dedication of the espirant to deep reflection on the abstract truths regarding the Self is only for the mature *uttamādhikārin*. His total dedication to reflection, *ipso facto*, implies his complete renunciation of the life of activity. Since it is only the constant reflection on the Self that directly leads to Self-Realisation, which is Perfection/Liberation, the Path of Knowledge alone is the proximate means to that Goal.

The Path of Action, according to the Ācārya, is only the remote means to the Goal. It is the remote path that leads to the proximate path of Knowledge. Though only the remote one, it alone is the Path for the not-so-mature *madhyamādhikārin*, who is ill-equipped to pursue reflection on the Self. By following the Path of Action exclusively, his mind gets purified (not necessarily in a single birth), and (only) after the mind is completely cleansed of the impurities, he gets the competence to take to the Path of

Knowledge. The 'perfection' which the aspirant in the Path of Action is said to attain to by the Lord (XVIII. 45-6), is according to the Ācārya, not the Perfection of Beatitude which is the Goal, and is attainable only by Knowledge, but the lesser mental perfection which makes him "qualified for steadfast adherence in the Path of Knowledge".

There are passages in the *Gītā* which appear to accord to the Path of Action the highest place among the spiritual disciplines. These, the Ācārya explains (away), as falling under *Artha-vāda* (praise, eulogy). *Artha-vāda* consists in over-praising a thing so as to enthuse the listener to betake himself to it. Arjuna and the majority of the people towhom the *Gītā* is addressed through him belong to the 'not-so-mature' type, who must immediately be weaned from pursuing their ego-centred and sense-oriented actions and directed to their dhārmic duties, otherwise called 'the Path of Action'. At their level, they could be persuaded to give up their easy way of living and indused to take upon the constraints of dharmic action only if that spiritual discipline is presented to them as the summum bonum. Therefore the Lord resorts to *Artha-Vāda.*

Any open-minded reader will be convinced that the Ācārya's interpretation alone brings out the true import of the *Gītā,* since we hear in it the Lord's categorical and unequivocal isolation of the two Paths in such statements as, "This which has been declared unto you is the wisdom in regard to Sāmkhya (the Path of Knowledge); Hearken now to the wisdom of the Yoga (Path of Action)'. (II.39); "by Jñāna-Yoga for the Sāṁkhyas, (and) by Karma-Yoga for the Yogins" (III.3). Having such statements as his main plank, the Ācārya explains and elucidates verse after verse of the Holy Text to establish that the Lord's settled and conclusive view is that the Path of Action and the Path of Knowledge are two distinct ones, meant respectively for the Karma-yogins and the Jñāna-yogins (who have adopted *saṁnyāsa*); and that a combination of the two paths is incompatible.

This is not to deny that the aspirant in the Path of Action must have a basic and general introduction into the verities concerning self-Knowledge, since there is no other means of deliverance to rescue one under misconception (p. 40, last para). The *Gītā*-teaching, in fact, commences only with instructions about the action-

less Self (II. 12 ff). Nor is the Ācārya unalive to the Enlightened Man of Knowledge also engging himself in action, simply for the sake of promoting the weal of the !orld. This is amply borne out by the Commentary on verses 20 and 24 of Chapter III; and, in fact, by the personal example of the Ācārya himself, an Enlightened Man of Knowledge ever engaged in spiritual service to humanity.

(As for Bhakti, Devotion to God, both the Man of Action and the Man of Knowledge partake of it on different levels, according to the Ācārya. In the case of the Man of Action, he has to dedicate the fruits of his actions to the Lord. His very performance of his natural duties is worship of the Lord, as is clearly stated by the Lord (XVIII.46). In the case of the Jnāni we have again the Lord's own declaration that he is the foremost among the devotees most beloved of Him (VII.17), nay, His very Self (VII.18). The Ācārya defines "highest devotion" as "consisting in the Knowledge of the Supreme Reality" (p. 397). In the Ācārya's Commentary on "My devotees" (XIII-18) we see beautifully delineated the Jñāni-Bhakta and also the Ācārya's own jnāna-bhakti towards the Lord; "he who has consigned his entire being to Me, the Supreme Lord, the Omniscient, the Supreme Teacher, Vāsudeva; —he, whose intellect (understanding) is permeated with the all-possessing idea that all the sees, hears, or touches are none but the Lord Vāsudeva" (p. 438).

According to the Acārya, God is not only the dispenser of the fruits of actions of those engaged in Karma-yoga, but it is equally by His Grace alone that even the Jnāni of the Sāmkhya-Yoga attains the Knowledge that is Realisation/Liberation. (Vide introduction to Ch. XV. p. 485).

* * *

It will be supreme enlightenment to know and assimilate what Śri Rāmakṛṣṇa has to say on the moot question, whether the Paths of Action, Devotion (belonging to the planes of dualism and qualified monism[1]) and Knowledge (belonging to the plane of monism) are separate or conjoined. We refer the reader to Śrī Śāradānanda's *Life*[2].

1. Though the term 'non-dualism' is preferable to 'monism', we go by the wording of the book to be quoted.

2. *Sri Ramakrishna, the Great Master*—Second Revised Edition, pp. 299-300.

..."The doctrines of dualism, qualified monism and monism came to each man of themselves with his spiritual progress. The Master, therefore, said that they were not contradictory to one another but depended on particular stages of evolution of the human mind ... It was ... necessary for the Master, the incarnation of the age, to realize all the three doctrines in different stages of his own life and propagate among all men their wonderful harmony ...

" Remember what the Master said on this topic :

" ' Know that the non-dual state of consciousness is the ultimate one to be realised; it is a realization that is beyond mind and speech ....

" 'On the part of ordinary human beings, in whom the attachment to worldly object prevails, dualism is commendable. ' "

Is it not clear from the above that the different doctrines, and therefore, the different paths *come one after the other*, and not together, each depending on the particular stage of the aspirant's evolution? Śri Rāmakṛṣṇa, be it noted, is stated to have realized them not conjointly or simultaneously but *in different stages of his life.*

The *sine qua non* of total renunciation of works (*saṁnyāsa*) for the aspirant on the Path of Knowledge (Non-dualism) is also corroborated by Śri Rāmakṛṣṇa when he says that it is a state "beyond mind and speech", therefore much more beyond action. Still more clearly:

" The Master put a limit to the performance of actions also for the spiritual development of man and said, ' The actions of a man with a predominance of Sattva naturally drop off. He cannot perform them in spite of his efforts to do so—to put it in another way, God does not allow him to do so' "[3]

In this connection we remember that the true Saṁnyāsin he was, Śri Rāmakṛṣṇa *could not* offer water-oblation in memory

3. ibid, p. 300.

of his mother[4], proving to the hilt that even dhārmic actions have to be renounced by the Man of Knowledge.

Equally with Śri Rāmakṛṣṇa, the Ācārya also did not hold the Paths as mutually contradictory. Otherwise how could the Path of Action itself equip the aspirant with the competence to enter into the Path of Knowledge? And, we also saw how he made Devotion part and parcel of both Action and Knowledge. This, and not rolling the different paths into a single amorphous amalgam, is what evidently is called the 'wonderful hamony' propagated by Śri Rāmakṛṣṇa.

Having given the attestation of Śri Rāmakṛṣṇa, it would be superfluous to add anything more by way of introducing the Commentary to the reader, who is exhorted to study it reverentially with the sole object of understanding it, and to profit himself by clearing his mind of any misconceptions he may have at the outset, so that at the conclusion he can exclaim, even as Arjuna did at the conclusion of the *Gitopadeśa* :

Naṣṭo mohaḥ smṛtirlabdhā "

" Gone is delusion, and remembrance (of the true nature of the Self) regained! "

OM TAT SAT

4. ibid, pp. 310-311.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This version in English of the *Bhagavad Gītā*, with the Commentary of Śri Śaṅkarācārya and Notes, is the result of a pious obligation undertaken at the behest of the translator's Guru, Pūjya Śrī "Aṇṇā" N. Subramania Aiyar of the Sri Ramakrishna Mission Students' Home, Madras. Without his incitation, inspiration, blessings and help, it could simply not have been produced. It was he who provided copies of the text of the Commentary with Ānandagiri's Gloss (*Ṭīka*) in Sanskrit, published by the Anandasrama Press, Poona, and of the translation in English by Śri A. Mahādeva Śāstri, published by V.V. R. Sastrulu & Sons, Madras. He also gave a copy of the edition of the text with translation and Notes in English by Śrimat Svāmi Svarūpānanda, published by the Ramakrishna Mission.

Acknowledgment is duly rendered for help derived from the Works above-mentioned, as also the *Gita-Tattva Numbers* and the Hindi translation of the Commentary, published by the Gita Press, Gorakhpur.

Translator

KEY TO THE TRANSLITERATION AND PRONUNCIATION

अ	a	o in 'son'
आ	ā	a in 'far'
इ	i	i in 'bid'
ई	ī	ee in 'seed'
उ	u	u in 'bull'
ऊ	ū	oo in 'cool'
ऋ	ṛ	ru in French (Midway between ri and ru)
ॠ	ṝ	ṛ—long
ए	e	ay in 'say'
ऐ	ai	y in 'my'
ओ	o	o in 'no'
औ	au	ou in 'mouth'
ं	ṁ	ng (practically)
ः	ḥ	half-articulated
क	k	
ख	kh	ckh in 'blockhead'
ग	g	g in 'get'
घ	gh	gh in 'log-hut'
ङ	ṅ	ng (very close to ṁ)
च	c	ch in 'church'
छ	ch	chh in 'catch-him'
ज	j	
झ	jh	dgeh in 'hedge-hog'
ञ	ñ	(a more nasal form of ng)
ट	ṭ	t in 'to'
ठ	ṭh	th in 'ant-hill'
ड	ḍ	d in 'do'
ढ	ḍh	dh in 'god-hood,
ण	ṇ	
त	t	t in French
थ	th	th in 'thumb'
द	d	th in 'then'
ध	dh	theh in 'breathe-here
न	n	
प	p	
फ	ph	ph in 'loop-hole'
ब	b	
भ	bh	bh in 'abhor'

म	m	श	ś	c in 'Cecil'
य	y	ष	ṣ	sh (almost)
र	r	स	s	
ल	l	ह	h	
व	v			

Of the two forms "Śaṁkara" and "Śaṅkara" for the name of the Commentator, the latter is adopted in this book, since in the common spelling (without diacritical marks) the form "Sankara" has gained universal currency.

ABBREVIATIONS

Ā	Ānandagiris' gloss *Ṭikā* on Śrī Śaṅkara's Commentary.
Ai	Aitareya Upaniṣad.
Ai. Ār	Aitareya-Āraṇyaka.
Āp.	Āpastambha-Dharma-Sūtras.
Bo	Bodhāyana-Dharma-Sūtras.
Bṛ (Br)	Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad.
Br. Su.	Brahma-Sūtras.
Ch.	Chāndogya-Upaniṣad.
chap.	chapter.
Com.	Commentary by Śri Śaṅkarācārya.
Cp.	Compare.
et. seq.	et sequens (and the following).
ff	following.
Gau.	Gautama-Dharma-Sūtra.
ibid	ibidem (in the same place).
Īśa	Īśavāsya-Upaniṣad.
Jā.	Jābāla-Upaniṣad.
Ka.	Kaṭhā-Upaniṣad.
Ke.	Kena-Upaniṣad.
M.B.	Mahā-bhārata.
,, —Ādi	,, Ādi-Parva.
,, —Aśv.	,, Aśvamedha-Parva.
,, —Śānti	,, Śānti-Parva.
,, —Strī	,, Strī-Parva.
,, —Vana	,, Vana-Parva.
Mahā-Nā.	Mahā-Nārāyana-Upaniṣad.
Mā.	Māṇḍūkya-Upaniṣad.
Mu.	Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad.
M.S.	Manu-Smṛti.
Nā.	Nārāyaṇa-Upaniṣad.
p (plural pp)	page
Pr.	Praśna-Upaniṣad.
Rām.	Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa.
R.V.	Ṛg-Veda.
Śv.	Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad.
Tai. (Tait)	Taittirīya-Upaniṣad.

Tai. Ār.	..	Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka.
Tai. Br.	..	Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa.
Tai-Sam.	..	Taittirīya-Saṁhitā.
v. (plural vv.)	..	verse.
V.P. ..	..	Viṣṇu Purāṇa.
V.S. ..	..	Viṣṇu Sahasranāma.

CONTENTS

*

Wrapper *Gītopadeśa*, the Lord delivering the *Gītā* to Arjuna.

Frontispiece : Bhagavadpāda Śri Saṅkaracārya, the Commentator.

(Artist : 'Vinu')

ॐ

॥ श्रीमद्भगवद्गीता ध्यानश्लोकाः ॥

ŚRĪMAD BHAGAVAD-GĪTĀ DHYĀNA-ŚLOKAḤ

VERSES OF MEDITATION OF ŚRĪMAD BHAGAVAD-GĪTĀ[1]

श्री गणेशाय नमः ।

Śri Gaṇeśāya namaḥ

Obeisance to Śrī Ganeśa (, the Deity who wards off obstacles).

श्री गोपालकृष्णाय नमः ।

Śrī Gopālakṛṣṇāya namaḥ

Obeisance to Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the Cowherd (the Gifter of the Gītā).

ॐ पार्थाय प्रतिबोधितां भगवता नारायणेन स्वयम्
व्यासेन ग्रथितां पुराणमुनिना मध्ये महाभारतम् ।
अद्वैतामृतवर्षिणीं भगवतीमष्टादशाध्यायिनी-
मम्ब त्वामनुसंदधामि भगवद्गीते भवद्वेषिणीम् ॥ १ ॥

Om Pārthāya pratibodhitām Bhagavatā Nārāyaṇena svayam
Vyāsena grathitām purāṇa-muninā madhye Mahābhāratam
Advaitāmṛta varṣiṇīm Bhagavatīm-aṣṭādaśādhyāyinīm

1. These irvocatory verses are recited at the commencement of a *Gītā*-session.

Amba tvām-anusaṁdadhāmi Bhagavad-Gīte bhava-dveṣiṇīm

(ON THE GĪTĀ, PERSONIFIED AS A GODDESS)

Om. O Mother, Bhagavad-Gītā!—with whom Pārtha (Arjuna) was enlightened by Lord Nārāyaṇa (Viṣṇu) Himself (in His incarnation as Kṛṣṇa); and who was incorporated in the Mahā-Bhārata by the ancient sage Vyāsa; who consists of eighteen chapters and showers the nectar of Advaita; who is the Destroyer of saṁsāra (metempsychosis),—on Thee, O Goddess! I meditate. (1)

नमोऽस्तु ते व्यास विशालबुद्धे फुल्लारविन्दायतपत्र नेत्र ।
येन त्वया भारततैलपूर्णः प्रज्वालितो ज्ञानमयः प्रदीपः ॥ २ ॥

Namōstu tē Vyāsa viśāla-buddhē pullāravindāyata-patra-netra
Yena tvayā Bhārata-taila-pūrṇaḥ prajvālito jñāna-mayaḥ pradīpaḥ

(ON VYĀSA, THE AUTHOR OF THE MAHĀBHĀRATA, WHICH INCORPORATES THE GĪTĀ)

O Vyāsa of extensive intellect; Thou with eyes large as the petals of a full-blown lotus; by whom the light[2] of wisdom (in the lamp) filled with the oil of Mahā-bhārata was kindled! May (this) salutation be to Thee. (2)

प्रपन्नपारिजाताय तोत्त्रवेत्रैकपाणये ।
ज्ञानमुद्राय कृष्णाय गीतामृतदुहे नमः ॥ ३ ॥

2. Namely, the *Bhagavad-Gitā itself*.

Prapanna-pārijātāya tottra-vetraika-pāṇaye
Jāñna-mudrāya Kṛṣṇāya Gītāmṛta-duhe namaḥ

(On Śrī Kṛṣṇa, who delivered the Gītā)

Salutation to Kṛṣṇa, the Milker of the Gītā-nectar, Who is the Pārijata[3] of those taking refuge in Him and Who holds a whip of cane in one hand and the jñāna-mudrā[4] (in the other). (3)

सर्वोपनिषदो गावो दोग्धा गोपालनन्दनः ।
पार्थो वत्सः सुधीर्भोक्ता दुग्धं गीतामृतं महत् ॥ ४ ॥

Sarvopaniṣado gāvo dogdhā Gopāla-nandanaḥ
Pārtho vatsaḥ sudhīr-bhokta dugdham Gītāmṛtam mahat

With all the Upaniṣads as cows and Pārtha as calf, the Son of the cowherd[5] as milkman has extracted the supreme milk of the nectar of the Gītā, for the enjoyment of the man that hath a purified understanding. (4)

वसुदेवसुतं देवं कंसचाणूरमर्दनम् ।
देवकीपरमानन्दं कृष्णं वन्दे जगद्गुरुम् ॥ ५ ॥

Vasudeva-sutam devam Kaṁsa-Cāṇūra-mardanam
Devakī-paramānandam Kṛṣṇam vande jagad-gurum

3. One of the five wish-yielding trees of heaven, produced at the churning of the ocean.

4. Mudrās are symbolic signs of the fingers. In the Jñāna-mudrā or sign of Wisdom, the forefinger and the thumb of the right hand are joined together to denote the union of the individual soul with the Absolute.

5. The Lord was the foster-son of Nanda, the cowherd prince. "Gopāla-nandanaḥ" may also be translated as 'the delighter of the cowherds'.

I salute Kṛṣṇa, the Son of Vasudeva, the supreme delight of Devaki, the Destroyer of (the demon) Kaṁsa and (the demoniac wrestler) Cāṇūra, (verily) God (Himself), the Teacher (Guru) of the universe. (5)

भीष्मद्रोणतटा जयद्रथजला गान्धारनीलोपला
शल्यग्राहवती कृपेण वहनी कर्णेन वेलाकुला ।
अश्वत्थाम-विकर्ण-घोरमकरा दुर्योधनावर्तिनी
सोत्तीर्णा खलु पाण्डवै रणनदी कैवर्तकः केशवः ॥ ६ ॥

Bhīṣma-Droṇa-taṭā Jayadratha-jalā gāndhāranīlopalā
Śalya-grāhavati Kṛpeṇa vahanī Karṇena velākulā
Aśvatthāma-Vikarṇa-ghora-makarā Duryodhanāvartinī
Sottīrṇā khalu Pāṇḍavai raṇa-nadī kaivartakaḥ Keśavaḥ

The battle-river—with Bhīṣma and Droṇa as its banks and Jayadratha as the water; with the prince of Gāndhāra (Śakuni) as the dark rock, Śalya as the shark, and with Kṛpa as the current, Karṇa as the distacting tides, and Aśvatthāmā and Vikarṇa as terrible crocodiles (therein); and Duryodhana as the whirl-pool (in it)—was indeed crossed over by the Pāṇḍavas, through the grace of Keśava (Kṛṣṇa) Who was their ferryman.[6] (6)

पाराशर्यवचः सरोजममलं गीतार्थगन्धोत्कटं
नानाख्यानक-केसरं हरिकथा-सम्बोधनाबोधितम् ।
लोके सज्जन षट्पदैरहरहः पेपीयमानं मुदा
भूयाद्भारतपंकजं कलिमलप्रध्वंसि नः श्रेयसे ॥ ७ ॥

6. The names given here are those of the important warriors of the army of the Kauravas with whom the Pāṇḍavas battled.

Pārāśarya-vacaḥ sarojam-amalam Gītārtha-gandhotkaṭam
Nānākhyanaka-kesaram Harikathā-sadbhānunā bodhitam
Loke sajjana ṣat-padair-aharahaḥ pepīyamānam mudā
Bhūyād-Bhārata-paṁkajam Kali-mala-pradhvamsi naḥ śreyase

(ON THE EPIC MAHĀ-BHĀRATA, IN WHICH THE BHAGAVAD-GĪTĀ OCCURS)

May the taintless lotus of the Mahā-bhārata—growing in the lake of Pārāśaryā's[7] words; richly endowed with the fragrance of the meaning of the Gītā; with many an episode as its stamens; fully opened by the pure sunlight of the discurses[7] on Hari[8] (Viṣṇu); whose nectar is drunk joyously day after day by the bees of the good virtuous men in the world; and which destroys the impurities of the Kali age—be for our supreme good. (7)

मूकं करोति वाचालं पङ्गुं लंघयते गिरिम् ।
यत्कृपा तमहं वन्दे परमानन्द माधवम् ॥ ८ ॥

Mūkam karoti vācālam paṅgum laṁghayate girim
Yat-kṛpā tam-aham vande paramānanda Mādhavam

(AGAIN, ON ŚRI KṚṢṆA)

I salute the All-bliss Mādhava, Whose grace makes the mute eloquent, and the cripple leap over mountain. (8)

7. Sage Vyāsa, the son of Sage Parāśara.

8. Occurring in it and also specially in the supplement known as *Harivaṁśa*.

यं ब्रह्मा वरुणेन्द्ररुद्रमरुतः स्तुन्वन्ति दिव्यैः स्तवैः
वेदैः साङ्गपदक्रमोपनिषदैर्गायन्ति यं सामगाः।
ध्यानावस्थित-तद्गतेन मनसा पश्यन्ति यं योगिनो
यस्यान्तं न विदुः सुरासुरगणा देवाय तस्मै नमः ॥९॥

Yam Brahmā-Varuṇendra-Rudra-Marutaḥ stunvanti divyaiḥ stavaiḥ
Vedaiḥ sāṅga-pada-kramopaniṣadair-gāyanti yam Sāmagāḥ
Dhyānāvasthita tad-gatena manasā paśyanti yam yogino
Yasyāntam na viduḥ surāsura-gaṇā Devāya tasmai namaḥ

Salutation to that Effulgent Being, Whom Brahmā, Varuṇa, Indra, Rudra and the Maruts praise with divine hymns; Whom the chanters of the Sāmans[9] sing through the Vedas, with their full complement of the auxiliary sciences (Vedāṅgas)[10] in (the various modes of recitation known)as *Pada, Krama* etc., and with the Upaniṣads; Whom the yogins perceive with their minds absorbed in Him through steadiness in meditation; and Whose limit even the hosts of Devas and Asuras know not. (9)

9. Verses of the *Sāma-Veda*.

10. *Śikṣā* (phonetics), *Kalpa* (ritual), *Vyākaraṇa* (grammar), *Nirukta* (etymology), *Chandas* (prosody) and *Jyotiṣa* (astronomy).

ओं तत्सत् ब्रह्मणे नमः

Om Tat-sat Brahmane namaḥ

Om ! Obeisance to That Truth Absolute !

श्रीमद्भगवद्गीता शांकरभाष्यम्

Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītā Śāṅkara-Bhāṣyam

THE COMMENTARY OF ŚAṄKARA ON ŚRĪMAD-BHAGAVAD-GĪTĀ

उपोद्घातः

UPODGHATAḤ

INTRODUCTION

ओं नारायणः परोऽव्यक्तादण्डमव्यक्तसंभवम् ।
अण्डस्यान्तस्त्विमे लोकाः सप्तद्वीपा च मेदिनी ॥

Om Nārāyaṇaḥ paro(a) vyaktād-aṇḍam-avyakta-saṁbhavam
Aṇḍasyāntastvime lokāḥ sapta-dvīpā ca medinī

Om. Nārāyaṇa[1] is beyond the Unmanifest[2]; the Aṇḍam[3] has arisen from the Unmanifest; and these worlds[4] and the Earth,[5] comprising the seven *dvīpas*[6], are verily within the *Aṇḍam* (*Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*; *M.S.* I. 11).

1. The revered Commentator commences this important work in the traditional manner with the contemplation of the *Iṣṭa-Devatā* (one's chosen Deity) Nārāyaṇa. (A)

cp. But beyond the Unmanifest is the Supreme Person all-pervading and devoid of all marks, knowing whom man gets freed and attains immortality. (Ka. VI. 8).

2. *Avyaktam* : This is described in XIII-5 Com. as the *Avyākṛta* (un-differentiated *Iśvara-Sakti* (Power of the Lord), otherwise called *Māyā*, which is the seed-force supporting the cosmic process.

3. The Cosmic-Egg (*Brahmāṇḍam*) represents Hiraṇyagarbha (figuratively termed *Mṛtyu* - Death in *Bṛ* I-ii-1 and 2 Com.)

4. Within the Cosmic Egg sprang up Prajāpati—Virāj, the First-born—the Being identified with the sum-total of all bodies (*Bṛ.* I-ii-2 and Com.). From Virāj are formed the words, *Bhūḥ* and others, fourteen in all.

5. *Medinī* : The earth is so called because it is mixed with the fat (*medas*) of the demons Madhu and Kaiṭabha, who were slain by Lord Visnu.

6. Jambū, Plakṣa, Śālmali, Kuśa, Krauñca, Śāka, and Puṣkara are the seven dvīpas (Islands).

He, the Lord, having created this universe, and desirous of ensuring its sustenance, first created Marīci and other Prajāpatis[7], and made them hold on to the Religious Path characterised by Action[8], mentioned in the Veda. And then, He created others[9] such as Sanaka and Sanandana and made them adopt the Religious Path of Renunciation[10], characterised by Knowledge and Non-attachment. This two-fold Religion enjoined by the Veda, characterised by Action and by Renunciation, is verily the cause of the sustenance of the universe. And this Religion, being the direct cause of the prosperity as well as of the liberation of sentient beings, has been practised by Brāhmanas and others, belonging to the several castes[11] and orders of life[12], as they wished to secure welfare (here and hereafter).

When after a long time[13], owing to the upsurge of desire[14] in (the minds of) its followers and the consequent diminution of

7. Lords of created beings. According to *Manu Smṛti* (I-34), they are ten in number. See also *Bhāgavata* II-xii-21, 22, according to which the other nine are : Atri, Aṅgiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, Bhṛgu, Vasiṣṭha, Dakṣa and Nārada.

8. *Pravṛtti* : Literally, 'tendency to go outward' i.e., activity. (XVIII-46 Com.; see also XVIII-30 Com.).

9. The four 'Sana's (the other two, not mentioned in the text, being Sanātana and Sanatkumāra) are the earliest teachers of *Ātma-tattva* (the true nature of the Self). See *Bhāgavata* II-vii-5.

10. *Nivṛtti* : Literally, 'tendency to come back', i.e., abstain from activity (See also XVIII-30 Com.).

11. The four principal castes (*varṇas*) are Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Sūdra, respectively looking after the spiritual and secular wisdom, the political governance, the economic well-being and the manual servicing of the people.

12. The four orders '*āśramas*' are Brahmacarya, Gārhastya, Vānaprastha and Saṃnyāsa, respectively the modes of life of the religious student observing celibacy, the married house-holder, the hermit living in the forest and carrying out Vedic rites and the ascetic who has completely renounced the world and all its duties, including Vedic rites.

13. The Kṛta and the Treta Yugas had passed away and the Dvāpara Yuga was coming to its end. (Ā).

14. *Kāma* : Thirst for distant (i.e. unattained) objects (VII-11 Com.). It has special reference to sexual desire.

discreminative knowledge, Religion became suppressed by irreligion and irreligion was increasing. He, the Original Creator Viṣṇu, known by the name of Nārāyaṇa intent on the maintenance of the stability of the universe, was born, as it were[15], in amsa[16] of Vasudeva (the father) in Devaki (the mother) for the protection of the brāhmana-hood (spiritual potency) of the Earthly Brahman[17]. For, it is only by the protection of brāhmana-hood that the Religion of the Vedas can remain preserved, since the distinctions of castes and orders of life are based on it. And being ever possessed of (infinite) knowledge, sovereignty, power, strength, valour and splendour[18], He, the Lo!d controlling *Māyā*, the Original cause which belongs to Himself as Viṣṇu and is comprised of the three *guṇas*[19], appears by His own *Māyā* as if He were born, possessed of a body, and bestowing grace on the universe—though He is in fact the Unborn, the Indestructible, the Overlord of the entire creation[20],

15. The word *kila* in the text has the sense of 'feigned action' (unfettered by *karma*).

16. *Aṁśa* generally means 'part'. But the Kṛṣṇa-avatāra is held to be a full incarnation of the Lord. Therefore the term '*aṁśena*' in the text is explained by Ānandagiri as meaning 'with an inscrutable form produced by His own free will' (*svecchā-nirmitena māyā-mayena svarūpeṇa*).

17. The revered Commentator here follows the Smrti text: '*Bhaumasya Brahmano guptyai Vasudevād ajijanat*' (*M.B. Sānti* 47-29). (Ā)

'Earthly Brahman' refers to Vedas, Brāhmaṇas and *Yajñas* (sacrifices) (Nīlakanṭha). These constitute the three-fold expression of the Lord's Creative, Will on earth, according to the *Gitā* (XVII-23). Compare also Com. on the names '*Brahmaṇyaḥ*', '*Brahmakṛt*' and '*Brahma-vivardhanaḥ*' in V.S. (661 662 and 665), where 'Brahma' is explained thus: '*Tapo Vedāśca Viprāśca Jñānam ca Brahma-saṁjñitam*'. By 'Brahman' are denoted austerities, the Vedas, the Brāhmanas and Knowledge.

18. cp. *Aiśvaryasya samagrasya dharmasya yaśasaḥ śriyaḥ Jñānavairāgya yoścaiva ṣsṇṇām bhaga itīraṇā* (V.P. - VI-v-74). See also Com. on III-37)

19. See XIV-5 et. eq. and Com. for a description of the *guṇas*. *Māyā* has no existence apart from, and does not act independently of, the Lord who however is quite independent of it. Herein lies the distinction between the *Māyā* of the Vedānta and the *Prakṛti* (also called *Pradhāna*) of the Sāṁkhya school.

20. Closely follows IV-6. See Com. thereon.

by nature Eternal, Pure, Intelligent, and Free. Out of sheer grace towards living beings (His creatures)-there being no personal interest of His own-He imparted knowledge of the two Paths of the Vedic Religion to Arjuna[21] who was submerged in the vast ocean of sorrow and delusion, feeling that Religion would attain widespread growth only when grasped and put into practice by persons of exalted qualities[22]. That Religion as taught by the Lord, the omniscient and adorable Veda-Vyāsa incorporated together in seven hundred verses called *Gitās*[23].

This well-known *Gitā-Śāstra* is the epitome and essence of the teaching of all the Vedas and its meaning can be discerned only with great difficulty. Even though it has been commented upon by several (commentators), by construing the meaning word by word and sentence by sentence, and with the aid of logical arguments,[24] with a view to bringing out its import, I have observed that it has been comprehended by the common people as an eclectic composition of diverse contradictory doctrines. I am (therefore) writing a brief commentary for determining the precise import with correct judgment.

Final Beatitude, characterised by the complete cessation of *saṁsāra*[25] with its root-cause, is in brief the object of this well-known *Gītā Śāstra* (Scripture of Gītā); and that is attained through the Religion (Dharma) whose dominant note is fixity in Self-Knowledge, preceded by *Saṁnyāsa*, complete renunciation of all *karmas* (action). So also, referring to this Religion which is the purport of the *Gītā*, the Lord Himself has said in the *Anu-Gītās*[26]:

21. The third among the Pāṇḍava princes, and a dear friend of the Lord (see XI-41 and 42, and XVIII-64).

22. cp. III-21.

23. Vyāsa incorporated the *Gītā* in the divsion "Bhīṣma Parva" of his epic *Mahā-Bhārata*. See colophons at end of chapters.

24. According to Indian Logic (*Tarka-śāstra*), the five-membeied syllogism comprises *Pratijñā* (statement of the proposition to be proved), *hetu* (the reason for an inference-middle term), *udāharaṇa* (illustration), *upanaya* (the application to the case in question) and *nigamana* (the deduction ; conclusion).

25. Succession of births ; metempsychosis.

26. Forming chapters 16 to 51 of the "Aśvamedha-parva" of the *Mahābhārata*.

'For the attainment of the state of Brahman, that Religion indeed is fully competent and adequate' (*M.B.-Aśv.* 16-12)

And it is further stated therein (*i.e.* in the *Anu-Gītās*) :

'He is without (free from) merit and without demerit, without weal and without woe (Ibid 19-7) ;

'He who may be merged in the Sole Seat[27], silent and conceiving nothing' (Ibid. 19-1) ;

also—'Knowledge, having renunciation as its attribute' (Ibid. 43-23).

Here (the present work, *Gītā*) also, at the end Arjuna is thus exhorted:

'Discarding all dharmas[28], resort to Me alone as refuge' (XVIII-66).

The religious Path characterised by Action has been prescribed in respect of the (several) castes and orders of life with the object of securing their prosperity; and it is also the means of attaining the position of gods[29] and the like. Nonetheless, if practised with a sense of dedication to the Lord and without the desire for (the enjoyment of) the fruits, it brings about purity of mind; and by him of a pure mind is gained the means for securing final beatitude,[30] successively through the attainment of competence for the acquisition of (spiritual) Knowledge and the actual dawn of (spiritual) Knowledge. Accordingly, having in mind this very same import, the Lord says :

' Dedicating actions to Brahman ' (V-10) ; and

' Yogins perform (their) actions, leaving all attachment, for their self-purification '[31] (V-11).

27. i.e. the support (Brahman. (Ā)

28. Righteous deeds as also unrighteous deeds (XVIII-66 Com.).

29. *devādisthāna-prāpti* : means also ' reaching the abode of gods etc.'

30. For a full discussion of this topic, see XVIII-45 to 55 and Com.

31. *Ātma-śuddhi*—' ātma ' (self) here means ' the mind ' (V. 11 Com.).

The *Gītā - śāstra* unfold this two-fold Religion, having for its aim final beautiude; and, in especial, it has for its subject-matter the nature of the Supreme Truth, Para-Brahman, known as Vāsudeva. It[32] thus bears a specific relation (to both). As by the comprehension of its import, the achievement of all the aspirations[33] of human life is secured. I am undertaking to explain it.

32. Here are stated the *anubandha-catuṣṭaya,* the four mutually connected elements of a *Āāstra* (scripture), namely.

Viṣaya, the subject-matter (Para Brahman) ;

Prayojana, the object in view (*mokṣa,* final beatitude) ;

Adhikārin, the competent aspirant (he who seeks deliverance from *saṁsāra*) ; and

Saṁbandha, connection. (This work explains the subject to the aspirant and equips him with the means for attaining the object.).

33. The four *puruṣārthas—Dharma* (Moral Law), *Artha* (wealth), *Kāma* (worldly enjoyment) and *Mokṣa* (Liberation).

॥ श्रीमद्भगवद्गीता ॥

ŚRĪMAD BHAGAVADGĪTĀ

THE HOLY SONG OF THE LORD

॥ प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥

PRATHAMO(A)DHYĀYAḤ

CHAPTER I

(अर्जुन विषाद योगः)

(ARJUNA VIṢĀDA YOGAḤ)

(YOGA OF THE DEJECTION OF ARJUNA)

धृतराष्ट्र उवाच—

धर्मक्षेत्रे कुरुक्षेत्रे समवेता युयुत्सवः ।
मामकाः पाण्डवाश्चैव किमकुर्वत सञ्जय ॥ १ ॥

Dhṛtarāṣṭra uvāca—
Dharmakṣetre Kurukṣetre samavetā yututssvaḥ
Māmakāḥ Pāṇḍavāścaiva kim-akurvata Sañjaya

Dhṛtarāṣṭra spoke[1]—

1. *Prelude to the Gītā*—All negotiations with the Kaurava Prince Duryodhana for the peaceful restoration of their kingdom to the Pāṇḍavas, their cousins, having failed, both sides prepared themselves for war. The Lord, Śrī Kṛṣṇa, consented to serve as charioteer to Arjuna, the third of the five Pāṇḍava brothers, but without Himself participating in battle by taking up arms, and to place His powerful army at the disposal of Duryodhana. The sage Veda-Vyāsa offered Dhṛtarāṣṭra, the father of Duryodhana, the gift of transcendent vision to enable him to view the battle; but as the latter did not wish directly to witness the carnage among members of his own family, and wanted merely to hear an account of what occurred, the gift was bestowed on Sañjaya, Dhṛtarāṣṭra's companion and counsellor. On the tenth day of the war, Bhīṣma, the doyen of the Kuru race (to which the warring parties belonged) and Commander-in-Chief of Duryodhana's forces, was beaten and lay on his bed of arrows, awaiting the advent of Uttarāyaṇa (the winter solstice) for quitting the body. When this news was conveyed to himfy Sañjaya, Dhṛtarāṣṭra wished to hear a detailed account of the wai-situation from the beginning. Here commences the first chapter of the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, forming the twenty-fifth chapter of the "Bhīṣma Parva" of the *Mahā-Bhārata*.

1. O Sañjaya, having met on the holy field of Kuru-kṣetra[2], eager for battle, what did my sons and those of Pāṇḍu do?

सञ्जय उवाच—

दृष्ट्वा तु पाण्डवानीकं व्यूढं दुर्योधनस्तदा ।
आचार्यमुपसंगम्य राजा वचनमब्रवीत् ॥ २ ॥

Sañjaya uvāca—
Drṣṭvā tu Pāṇḍavānīkam vyūḍham Dutyodhanas-tadā
Ācāryam-upasaṁgamya rājā vacanam-abravīt

Sañjaya said—
2. And then, seeing the forces of the Pāṇḍavas marshalled, King[3] Duryodhana, approaching the teacher[4], spoke (these) words—

पश्यैतां पाण्डुपुत्राणामाचार्य महतीं चमूम् ।
व्यूढं द्रुपदपुत्रेण तव शिष्येण धीमता ॥ ३ ॥

Paśyaitām Pāṇḍu-putrāṇām-ācārya mahatīm camūm
Vyūḍham Drupada-putreṇa tava śiṣyeṇa dhīmatā

3. " Behold, O Master, this great army of the sons of Pāṇḍu, arrayed for battle by your gifted disciple, the son[5] of Drupada.

2. Kurukṣetra lies between the modern towns of Delhi and Ambala. Austerities were performed there by gods and by King Kuru, the founder of the race bearing his name ; hence it is considered as a holy tract. It is said that King Kuru was continuously ploughing the area with a golden plough, and when Indra (the lord of gods) enquired of him his motive, he asked for the boon that the seed of Dharma sown there should grow for ever.

3. Duryodhana was actually exercising regal power, his father Dhṛtarāṣṭra being only a titular sovereign.

4. Droṇācārya, who taught archery both to the Karuravas and to the Pāṇḍavas and also to Dhṛṣṭadyumna (infra. 5). After the fall of Bhīṣma, he was commander-in-chief of the Kaurava army from the eleventh to the fifteenth day of the war. See laso XI-34 Com.

5. Dhṛṣḍadyumna (son of Drupada), born in the sacrificial altar, was the predestined slayer of Droṇa. He was one of commander-in-chiefs of the Pāṇḍava army . See 41 infra.

अत्र शूरा महेष्वासा भीमार्जुनसमा युधि ।
युयुधानो विराटश्च द्रुपदश्च महारथः ॥ ४ ॥

Atra śūrā maheṣvāsā Bhīmārjuna-samā yudhi
Yuyudhāno Virāṭaśca Drupadaśca mahā-rathaḥ

4. " In this (army) are heroes—mighty bowmen, equal in combat to Bhima and Arjuna—(viz.) Yuyudhāna[6] and Virāṭa,[7] and Drupada,[8] the great warrior-chief[9];

धृष्टकेतुश्चेकितानः काशिराजश्च वीर्यवान् ।
पुरुजित्कुन्तिभोजश्च शैब्यश्च नरपुङ्गवः ॥ ५ ॥

Dhṛṣṭaketuś-cekitānaḥ Kāśirājāsca vīryavān
Purujit-Kuntibhojacśa Śaibyaśca nara-puṅgavaḥ

5. "Dhṛṣṭaketu,[10] Cekitāna,[11] and the King[12] of Kāśi,

6. Sātyaki, son of Śini (a Yādava chieftain) and a disciple of Arjuna. He was counted as an *ati-ratha*—i.e., an unrivalled warrior, fighting from his chariot and capable of engaging single-handed any number of foes (*amitān yodhayet yastusa prokto - atiratyaḥ*).

7. Father of Uttarā, who was married to Arjuna's son Abhimanyu, and of Śveta the first commander-in-chief of the Pāṇḍava army.

8. King of the Pañcālas and father of Draupadī, wife of the Pāṇḍavas.

9. *Mahā-rathaḥ* : a warrior fighting from his chariot, who can engage in battle ten thousand archers and is well-versed in the science of arms. (*eko daśa-sahasrāṇi yodhayet, yastu dhanvinām, śastra-śāstra-pravīṇaśca*).

10. Son of Śiśupāla, king of Cedi.

11. A Yādava hero belonging to the Vṛṣṇi clan (to which Śrī Kṛṣṇa also belonged) and commander of one of the seven *akṣsauhiṇis* of the Pāṇḍava host. (*An akṣauhiṇi* is a division of army consisting of 21870 chariots, as many elephants 65610 horses and 109350 foot-soldiers).

12. His name is mentioned in the *M.B.* as Abhibhū.

possessed of valour; Purujit[13] and Kuntibhoja,[14] and Haibya,[15] the foremost of men;

युधामन्युश्च विक्रान्त उत्तमौजाश्च वीर्यवान् ।
सौभद्रो द्रौपदेयाश्च सर्व एव महारथाः ॥ ६ ॥

Yudhāmanyuśca vikrānta Uttamaujāśca vīryavān
Saubhadro Draupadeyāśca sarva eva mahārathāḥ

6. "And Yudhāmanyu,[16] the overpowering; and Uttamauja,[17] the valiant; the son[18] of Subhadrā and the sons[19] of Draupadī—all of them great warrior-chiefs.

अस्माकं तु विशिष्टा ये तान्निबोध द्विजोत्तम ।
नायका मम सैन्यस्य संज्ञार्थं तान्ब्रवीमि ते ॥ ७ ॥

Asmākam tu viśiṣṭā ye tān-nibodha dvijottama
Nāyakā mama sainyasya saṁjñārtham tān-bravīmi te

7. "O best of the twice-born,[20] know also those who

13 & 14: Both were brothers of Kuntī, the mother of the Pāṇḍavas.

15. Father of Devikā, wife of Yudhiṣṭira, the eldest of the Pāṇḍavas. He was noted for his heroism in battle as well as for his virtuous character.

16 & 17: were brothers and princes of Pañcāla territory. They fought with valour through the eighteen days of the war and were slain in the night, while asleep, by Aśvatthāmā, son of Droṇa and friend of Duryodhana.

18. Abhimanyu, Arjuna's son by Subhadrā, the Lord's sister. He was overpowered by several *mahā-rathas* of the Kaurava army against all rules of righteous warfare and killed on the thirteenth day of the war.

19. Prativindhya, Śrutasoma, Śrutakarma, Śatānīka, and Śrutasena, respectively the sons of the five Pāṇḍavas. All of them were butchered in the night by Aśvatthāmā, after the end of the war.

20. Members of the three castes, Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya and Vaiśya are called the twice-born, because they are considered to be born again when they undergo the investiture ceremony for the study of the Vedas.

are eminent on our side, the commanders of my army: I refer to them for your information.

भवान् भीष्मश्च कर्णश्च कृपश्च समितिञ्जयः ।
अश्वत्थामा विकर्णश्च सौमदत्तिस्तथैव च ॥ ८ ॥

Bhavān Bhīṣmaśca Karṇaśca Kṛpaśca samitiñjayaḥ
Aśvatthāmā Vikarṇaśca Saumadattis-tathaiva ca

8. "Yourself, and Bhīṣma[21] and Karṇa[22]; and Kṛpa[23], (ever) victorious in battle; as also Aśvatthāmā[24] and Vikarṇa,[25] and the son[26] of Somadatta.

अन्ये च बहवः शूरा मदर्थे त्यक्तजीविताः ।
नानाशस्त्रप्रहरणाः सर्वे युद्धविशारदाः ॥ ९ ॥

Anye ca bahavaḥ śurā madarthe tyakta-jīvitāḥ
Nānā-śastra praharaṇāḥ sarve yuddha-viṣāradāḥ

21. See note 1 ante. He was endowed with great wisdom and prowess. Son of Śantanu by Gaṇgā, the river-goddness, and originally named Devarata, he earned the appellation Bhīṣma (the Terrible) for the dreadful vow of lifelong celibacy he took in order to make possible his father's second marriage with Satyavati, and was blessed by him to be proof against death unless he chose to die voluntarily. See also XI-34 Com.

22. Born of Kuntī in her girlhood. Forsaken by the mother as a child, he later became the lifelong and intimate friend of Duryodhana, by whom he was crowned king of Aṅga. He was commander-in-chief of the Kaurava army on the sixteenth and seventeenth days of the war and was killed by Arjuna. See also XI-34 Com.

23. Brother of Droṇa's wife Kṛpī. He taught archery to the Kaurava and the Pāṇḍava pirnces before Droṇa became their master. He is counted among the *cirajīvins*, the deathless human beings.

24. Son of Droṇa ; also counted a *cirajīvin.* See note 16 & 17 and 19 ante.

25. Third son of Dhṛtarāṣṭra ; an exception among the Kauravas, noted for his sense of justice and righteousness.

26. Bhūriśravā, grandson of King Śantanu's elder brother Bāhlika.

9. "And many other heroes, who have pledged to lay down their lives for me and are equipped with various weapons and missiles—all proficient in warfare—

अपर्याप्तं तदस्माकं बलं भीष्माभिरक्षितम् ।
पर्याप्तं त्विदमेतेषां बलं भीमाभिरक्षितम् ।। १० ।।

Aparyāptam tad-asmākam balam Bhīṣmābhirakṣitam
Paryāptam tvidam-eteṣām balam Bhīmābhirakṣitam

10. "That army of ours, completely protected by Bhīṣma, is unlimited (in fighting-power); but this army of theirs, protected by Bhīma on all sides, is limited (in fighting-power).[27]

अयनेषु च सर्वेषु यथाभागमवस्थिताः ।
भीष्ममेवाभिरक्षन्तु भवन्तः सर्व एव हि ।। ११ ।।

Ayaneṣu ca sarveṣu yathā-bhāgam-avasthitāḥ
Bhīṣmam-evābhirakṣantu bhavantaḥ sarva eva hi

11. "And, therefore[28], staying in your respective positions on all fronts, do you all, surely, guard Bhīṣma, in particular, on all sides."

27. The translation follows Ānandagiri. The verse is also differently interpreted to convey the opposite meaning : 'the Kaurava army is inadequate (*aparyāptam*) and the Pāḍṇava army is adequate (*paryāptam.*).

28. Duryodhana always considered that the army he had collected, which was much bigger and contained a larger number of valiant generals led by the great Bhīṣma (who could not be slain), was invincible and could win the war. But as Bhīṣma would cease to fight if opposed by Śikhaṇḍin (who was originally a woman and was therefore considered unworthy of combat by Bhīṣma), he exhorted his generals to guard Bhīṣma on all sides fom Sikhaṇḍi's approach.

तस्य सञ्जनयन्हर्षं कुरुवृद्धः पितामहः ।
सिंहनादं विनद्योच्चैः शंखं दध्मौ प्रतापवान् ।। १२ ।।

Tasya sañjanayan harṣam kuruvṛddhaḥ pitāmahaḥ
Siṁha-nādam vinadyoccaiḥ śaṁkham dadhmau pratāpavān

12. Gladdening his (Duryodhana's) heart, the grand old man of the Kaurava race, the heroic grand-sire[29], loudly roared like a lion and blew his conch.

ततः शंखाश्च भेर्यश्च पणवानकगोमुखाः ।
सहसैवाभ्यहन्यन्त स शब्दस्तुमुलोऽभवत् ।। १३ ।।

Tataḥ śaṁkhāśca bheryaśca panavānaka gomukhāḥ
Sahasaivābhyahanyanta sa śabdas-tumulo-(a)bhavat

13. Thereafter, conches and kettle-drums, tabors, drums and horns, were sounded all at once; and that noise was tumultuous.

ततः श्वेतैर्हयैर्युक्ते महति स्यन्दने स्थितौ ।
माधवः पाण्डवश्चैव दिव्यौ शंखौ प्रदध्मतुः ।। १४ ।।

Tataḥ śvetair-hayair-yukte mahati syandane sthitau
Mādhavaḥ Pāṇḍavaścaiva divyau śaṁkhau pradadhmatuḥ

14. Then, stationed in an eminent[30] war-chariot yoked

29. Bhīṣma.

30. Arjuna's chariot which was large and excellent in every way and was covered all over with a plate of gold was presented to him by the god of Fire (Agni) for assistance given while devouring the Khāṇḍava forest. It could go anywhere on earth and in the heavens without obstruction.

to white horses,[31] Mādhava[32] and the son of Pāṇḍu[33] (blew) their divine conches,—

पाञ्चजन्यं हृषीकेशो देवदत्तं धनञ्जयः ।

Pañcajanyam Hṛṣīkeśo Devadattam Dhanañjayaḥ

15. Hṛṣikeśa[34] (blew) the Pāñcajanya[35] and Dhanañjaya[36] (blew) the Devadatta[37].

पौण्ड्रं दध्मौ महाशंखं भीमकर्मा वृकोदरः ॥ १५ ॥

Pauṇḍram dadhmau mahā-saṁkham bhīma-karmā vṛkodaraḥ

Vṛkodara[38] of terrible deeds blew his great conch named Pauṇḍra ;

31. These were from among the hundred celestial horses presented to Arjuna by the Gandharva king Citraratha. The total number of the horses would always remain hundred, even though any number might be killed in action.

32. A name of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. It means—(1) Husband of Lakṣmi, the goddess of prosperity, (2) He who can be understood through the discipline of *Madhu-vidyā* (spoken of in *Bṛ*. II. v), (3) He who is realisable through silence, meditaion and union. (*V.S.* 72 Com.), (4) Master of *Vidyā* (Knowledge) *V.S.* 167 Com.); (5) He who had taken birth in the Madhu-race (*V.S.* 735 Com.).

33. Arjuna, the celebrated son of Pāṇḍu (cp. *Pāṇḍavānām Dhanañjayaḥ*-X-37).

34. A name of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, meaning : (1) Lord of the senses (the *Kṣetrajña*), (2) He who has the senses under control (the *Paramātman*), (3) He who in the form of the Sun and the Moon pleases the world by his rays (*V.S.* 47. Com.).

35. A demon named Pañcajana who had assumed the form of the conch-shell was killed by Kṛṣṇa and the conch was taken for His use.

36. Name of Arjuna, because he brought a vast store of riches, human and divine, for the *Rājasūya* sacrifice performed by Yudhiṣṭhira after, vanquishing many kings during his journey of conquest in all directions. (XVIII-29 Com.)

37. Name of the conch given by Indra, when Arjuna went to heaven to fight against the Nivātakavacas. (*M.B. Vana* 174-5).

38. Means the wolf-bellied, a name of Bhīma, the second of the Pāṇḍavas, significant of his voraciousness.

अनन्तविजयं राजा कुन्तीपुत्रो युधिष्ठिरः ।
नकुलः सहदेवश्च सुघोष-मणिपुष्पकौ ॥ १६ ॥

Anantavijayam rājā kuntīputro Yudhiṣṭhiraḥ
Nakulaḥ Sahadevaśca Sughoṣa-Maṇipuṣpakau

16. King Yudhiṣṭhira, the (first) son of Kuntī, (blew) the Anantavijaya; Nakula and Sahādeva[39] (blew respectively their conches named) Sughoṣa and Maṇipuṣpaka.

काश्यश्च परमेष्वासः शिखण्डी च महारथः ।
धृष्टद्युम्नो विराटश्च सात्यकिश्चापराजितः ॥ १७ ॥
द्रुपदो द्रौपदेयाश्च सर्वशः पृथिवीपते ।
सौभद्रश्च महाबाहुः शंखान्दध्मुः पृथक् पृथक् ॥ १८ ॥

Kāśyaśca parameṣvāsaḥ Śikhaṇḍī ca mahārathaḥ
Dhṛṣṭadyumno Virāṭaśca Sātyakiścāparājitaḥ

Drupado Draupadeyāṣca sarvaśaḥ pṛthivīpate
Saubhadraśca mahābāhuḥ saṁkhān dadhmuḥ pṛthak pṛthak

17—18. And the great bowman, the King of Kāśi, and the great warrior-chief Śikhaṇḍī,[40] Dhṛṣṭadyumna[41]

39. The last two of the Pāṇḍavas, these were the sons of Mādri, the second wife of Pāṇḍu.

40. See note 28 ante. He was the elder son of Drupada. Born a girl, changed sex later as a result of austere penance and the sympathy of a Yakṣa named Sthūṇakarṇa. Arjuna placed hm in front, between himself and the opposing Bhīṣma, and, when the latter desisted from fighting because of the female-turned-male, brought him down.

41. Second son of Drupada. See note 5 ante. He was the commander-in-chief of the Pāṇḍava army from the second day of the war to the end and was killed by Aśvatthāmā while alseep on the night of the eighteenth day.

and Virāṭa, and the invincible Sātyaki, Drupada and the sons of Draupadi, the son of Subhadrā, of powerful arms, O King, severally blew their conches from all sides.

स घोषो धार्तराष्ट्राणां हृदयानि व्यदारयत् ।
नभश्च पृथिवीं चैव तुमुलो व्यनुनादयन् ॥ १९ ॥

Sa ghoṣo Dhārtarāṣṭraṇām hṛdayāni vyadārayat
Nabhaśca pṛthivīm caiva tumulo vyanunādayan

19. That tumultuous sound, reverberating through heaven and earth, rent the hearts of Dhṛtarāṣṭra's sons (and of others on their side).

अथ व्यवस्थितान्दृष्ट्वा धार्तराष्टान्कपिध्वजः ।
प्रवृत्ते शस्त्रसंपाते धनुरुद्यम्य पाण्डवः ॥ २० ॥
हृषीकेशं तदा वाक्यमिदमाह महीपते ।

Atha vyavasthitān-dṛṣṭvā Dhārtarāṣṭrān-Kapidhvajaḥ
Pravṛtte śastra-sampāte dhanur-udyamya Pāṇḍavaḥ
Hṛṣīkeśam tadā vākyam-idam-āha mahīpate

20. Thereafter, O King, seeing your sons arrayed against him and the flight of missiles about to begin, the Monkey-bannered[42] son of Pāṇḍu raised his bow, and then spoke these words to Hṛṣīkeśa—

42. The monkey-hero Hanumān graced Arjuna's flag with his living presence, in accordance with his promise to Bhīma, striking terror in the enemy forces frequently by his loud roars. He also is counted as a *cirajīvin.*

अर्जुन उवाच

सेनयोरुभयोर्मध्ये रथं स्थापय मेऽच्युत ॥ २१ ॥
यावदेतान्निरीक्षेऽहं योद्धुकामानवस्थितान् ।
कैर्मया सह योद्धव्यमस्मिन्रणसमुद्यमे ॥ २२ ॥
योत्स्यमानानवेक्षेऽहं य एतेऽत्र समागताः ।
धार्तराष्ट्रस्य दुर्बुद्धेर्युद्धे प्रियचिकीर्षवः ॥ २३ ॥

Arjuna uvāca—

Senayor-ubhayor-madhye ratham sthāpaya me (A) cyuta
Yāvad etān nirīkṣe(a)ham yoddhukāmān avasthitān
Kair-mayā saha yoddhavyam asmin-raṇa samudyame
Yotsyamānān avekṣe(a)ham ya ete(a)tra samāgatāḥ
Dhārtarāṣṭrasay durbuddher-yuddhe priya-cikīrṣavaḥ

Arjuna said—

21-23. O Acyuta,[43] station my war-chariot between the two armies, the while I look at these marshalled here, eager for battle. I shall inspect with attention all these with whom I have to fight at the onset of this battle—these who are joined here ready to fight, wishing to please the wicked son of Dhṛtarāṣṭra in this war.

सञ्जय उवाच —

एवमुक्तो हृषीकेशो गुडाकेशेन भारत ।

43. A name of the Lord, meaning—(1) He who by his inherent power is ever-existent (in the past, present and future) (*V.S.* 100 Com.) ; (2) He who is bereft of the six modifications (– birth, subsistence, growth, transformation decay and death) (*V.S.* 318 Com.).

सेनयोरुभयोर्मध्ये स्थापयित्वा रथोत्तमम् ॥ २४ ॥
भीष्मद्रोणप्रमुखतः सर्वेषां च महीक्षिताम् ।
उवाच पार्थ पश्यैतान्समवेतान्कुरूनिति ॥ २५ ॥

Sañjaya uvāca—
Evam-kto Hṛṣīkeśo Guḍākeśena Bhārata
Senayor-ubhayor-madhye sthāpayitvā rathottamam
Bhīṣma-Droṇa-pramukhataḥ sarveṣām ca mahīkṣitām
Uvāca Pārtha paśyaitān-samavetān-Kurūn-iti

Sañjaya said—

24-25. O Bhārata[44]! Thus addressed by Guḍākeśa[45], Hṛṣīkeśa placed that splendid war-chariot between the two armies, opposite to Bhīṣma, Droṇa, and all the Kings, and said : " O Pārtha[46], behold these Kurus[47] gathered together".

तत्रापश्यत्स्थितान्पार्थः पितॄनथ पितामहान् ।
आचार्यान्मातुलान्भ्रातॄन्पुत्रान्पौत्रान्सखींस्तथा ॥ २६ ॥
श्वशुरान्सुहृदश्चैव सेनयोरुभयोरपि ।
तान्समीक्ष्य स कौन्तेयः सर्वान्बन्धूनवस्थितान् ॥ २७ ॥
कृपया परयाऽऽविष्टो विषीदन्निदमब्रवीत् ।

Tatrāpaśyat-sthitān-Pārthaḥ pitṛn-atha pitāmahān
Ācāryān-mātulān-bhrātṛn-putrān-pautrān-sakhīṁs-tathā

44. Descendant of Bharatā, son of Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā, who became a *Cakrvartin*, universal monarch.

45. Name of Arjuna, meaning " consequeror of sleep and sloth " (X-20 Com.)

46. Son of Prthā (Kuntī) ; from this name of Arjuna, the Lord got the name Pārthasārathi (the Charioteer of Pārtha).

47. Descendants of Kuru : refers both to the Pāṇḍavas (sons of Pāndu) and the Dhārtarāṣṭras (sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra).

Śvaśurān-suhṛdaścaiva senayor-ubhayor-api
Tān-samīkṣya sa Kaunteyaḥ sarvān bandhūn-avasthitān
Kṛpayā parayā(ā)viṣṭo viṣīdam-idam-abravīt

26-28. Then Pārtha saw fathers (paternal uncles), grand-fathers, teachers, maternal uncles, brothers, sons grandsons, as also companions, fathers-in-law, and friends as well, stationed there, in both armies. Perceiving all these kinsfolk[48] thus stationed, the son of Kuntī became dispirited, overpowered as he was by excessive compassion, and spoke thus—

अर्जुन उवाच —
दृष्ट्वेमं स्वजनं कृष्ण युयुत्सुं समुपस्थितम् ।। २८ ।।
सीदन्ति मम गात्राणि मुखं च परिशुष्यति ।
वेपथुश्च शरीरे मे रोमहर्षश्च जायते ।। २९ ।।

Dṛṣṭvemam svajanam Kṛṣṇa yuyutsum samupasthitam
Sīdanti mama gātrāṇi mukham ca pariśuṣyati
Vepathuśca śarīre me roma-harṣaśca jāyate

Arjuna said—

28-29. O Kṛṣṇa[49], on seeing these kinsfolk come together eager to fight, my limbs give way and my mouth goes dry; and a shiver passes through my body and my hair stands on end.

48. The relatives mentioned here also include those at one or more remove.

49. He whose essential nature is Sat-Cit-Ānanda. (*V.S.* 57 Com.). See also VI. 34 Com.

गाण्डीवं स्रंसते हस्तात्त्वक्चैव परिदह्यते ।
न च शक्नोम्यवस्थातुं भ्रमतीव च मे मनः ॥ ३० ॥

Gāṇḍīvam sraṁsate hastāt-tvakcaiva paridahyate
Na ca śaknomyavasthātum bhramatīva ca me manaḥ

30. The Gāṇḍīva[50] drops down from my hand, and my skin is burning all over; I am unable to stand steady, and my mind reels, as it were.

निमित्तानि च पश्यामि विपरीतानि केशव ।
न च श्रेयोऽनुपश्यामि हत्वा स्वजनमाहवे ॥ ३१ ॥

Nimittāni ca paśyāmi viparītāni Keśava
Na ca śreyo(a)nupaśyāmi hatvā svajanam-āhave

31. And, O Keśava[51], I see adverse omens; I do not also see any virtue in killing my kinsmen in battle.

न काङ्क्षे विजयं कृष्ण न च राज्यं सुखानि च ।
किं नो राज्येन गोविन्द किं भोगैर्जीवितेन वा ॥ ३२ ॥

Na kāṅkṣe vijayam Kṛṣṇa na ca rājyam sukhāni ca
Kim no rājyena Govinda kim bhogair-jivitena vā

50. A celestial bow which was kept successively by Brahmā, Prajāpati, Indra, Candra and Varuṇa. At the instance of Agni who was pleased with Arjuna (see note 30), Varuṇa presented it to Arjuna.

51. A name of the Lord, meaning : (1) He who has beautiful locks of hair on his head, (2) He to whom the Trinity - Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra (Śiva) - are subject, (3) He who slew the ogre Keśi, (*V.S.* 23 Com.), (4) the possessor of the beams of light transferred by Him to the sun and other luminaries, (5) He to whom belong the Powers, Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra, (6) He whose part-manifestations are Brahmā and Śiva (*V.S.* 648 Com.).

32. Kṛṣṇa, I do not long for victory, nor empire, nor comforts. O Govinda,[52] what is the use of a kingdom to us? Or of worldly enjoyments? Or even of life?

येषामर्थे काङ्क्षितं नो राज्यं भोगाः सुखानि च ।
त इमेऽवस्थिता युद्धे प्राणांस्त्यक्त्वा धनानि च ॥ ३३ ॥
आचार्याः पितरः पुत्रास्तथैव च पितामहाः ।
मातुलाः श्वशुराः पौत्राः श्यालाः संबन्धिनस्तथा ॥ ३४॥

Yeṣāmarthe kāṅkṣitam no rājyam bhogāḥ sukhāni ca
Ta ime(a)vasthitā yuddhe prāṇāṁs-tyaktvā dhanani ca
Acāryāḥ-pitaraḥ putrās-tathaiva ca pitāmahāḥ
Mātulāḥ śvaśurāḥ pautraāḥ śyālāḥ saṁbandhinas-tathā

33. These very persons, for whose sake kingdom, enjoyments and comforts are desired by us, stand here arrayed in battle, renouncing (their) lives and riches—

34. Teachers, fathers, sons; and in like manner, grand-fathers, maternal uncles, fathers-in-law, grand-sons, brothers-in-law, and also other relations by marriage.

एतान्न हन्तुमिच्छामि घ्नतोऽपि मधुसूदन ।
अपि त्रैलोक्यराज्यस्य हेतोः किं नु महीकृते ॥ ३५ ॥

52. Another name of the Lord, meaning : (1) He who lifted up the Earth, (2) Lord of cows, (3) He who causes Speech to reach Him (*V.S.* 187 Com.), (4) He who is attained through Speech, (5) He who is understood through Vedāntic texts (*V.S.* 539 Com.).

Etān-na hantum-icchāmi ghnato(a)pi Madhūsūdana
Api trailokya rājyasya hetoḥ kim nu mahīkṛte

55. Madhusūdana[53]! Though they should slay me, I do not wish to kill these (persons) even for the sovereignty of the three worlds; howmuch the less for the sake of an earthly kingdom !

निहत्य धार्तराष्ट्रान्नः का प्रीतिः स्याज्जनार्दन ।
पापमेवाश्रयेदस्मान्हत्वैतानाततायिनः ॥ ३६ ॥

Nihatya Dhārtarāṣṭrān-naḥ kā prītiḥ syāj-Janārdana
Pāpamevāśrayed-asmān hatvaitān-atatayinaḥ

36. After slaying the sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra, what pleasure can be ours, O Janārdana[54]? Sin alone will hold us fast, after killing these felons[55] (usurpers though they be).

तस्मान्नार्हा वयं हन्तुं धार्तराष्ट्रान्स्वबान्धवान् ।
स्वजनं हि कथं हत्वा सुखिनः स्याम माधव ॥ ३७ ॥

53. Slayer of the demon named Madhu (*V.S.* 73 Com.).

54. (1) He who kills wicked persons, (2) Or causes them to go to hell and the like places, (3) Slayer of Pañcajana—see note 35 ante, (4) He to whom the faithful beg for the grant of the ends of life - prosperity and liberation (vide Introduction) (*V.S.* 126 Com.; also X-18 Com.).

55. The following six classs of felons are mentioned in the *Śukra-nīti* : (i) Incendiary, (ii) Poisoner, (iii) Man frantically using weapon with intent to murder, (iv) Plunderer of wealth, (v) Dispossessor of land and (vi) Abductor of woman. *Agnido gāradāścaiva śāstronmatto dhanāpahān kṣṣetra-dārdharaścaltān ṣḍa vidyād-ātatāyinaḥ*). Duryodhana and his group were guilty of all the six kinds of felony.

Tasmān-nārhā vayam hantum Dhārtarāṣṭrān-sva-bāndhavān
Svajanam hi katham hatvā sukhinaḥ syāma Mādhava

37. Therefore, it will not befit us to kill our own kinsmen, the sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra; for, surely, after killing our own kinsfolk, how can we be happy, O Mādhava ?

यद्यप्येते न पश्यन्ति लोभोपहतचेतसः ।
कुलक्षयकृतं दोषं मित्रद्रोहे च पातकम् ॥ ३८ ॥
कथं न ज्ञेयमस्माभिः पापादस्मान्निवर्तितुम् ।
कुलक्षयकृतं दोषं प्रपश्यद्भिर्जनार्दन ॥ ३९ ॥

Yadyapyete na paśyanti lobhopahata cetasaḥ
Kula-kṣaya-kṛtam doṣam mitra-drohe ca pātakam
Katham na jñeyam-asmābhiḥ pāpād-asmān-nivartitum
Rula-kṣaya-kṛtam-doṣam prapaśyadbhir-Janārdana

38-39. Even if these (sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra), with their minds warped by avarice, do not see the evil resulting from extinction of families[56] and the sin in treachery to friends, why indeed should we—who perceive clearly the evil in the extinction of families—not think of recoiling from this crime, O Janārdana?

कुलक्षये प्रणश्यन्ति कुलधर्माः सनातनाः ।
धर्मे नष्टे कुलं कृत्स्नमधर्मोऽभिभवत्युत ॥ ४० ॥

56. *Kula*, family, signifies an expansive group of descendants of one common progentor.

Kula-kṣaye praṇaśyanti kula-dharmāḥ sanātanāḥ
Dharme naṣte kulam kṛtsnam-adharmo(a)bhibhavat-yuta

40. With the extinction of the family, the ancient family traditions[57] die away; and when the traditional religious observances (making for virtue) get lost, unrighteousness (or vice) overpowers the entire race.

अधर्माभिभवात्कृष्ण प्रदुष्यन्ति कुलस्त्रियः ।
स्त्रीषु दुष्टासु वार्ष्णेय जायते वर्णसंकरः ॥ ४१ ॥

Adharmābhibhavāt-Kṛṣṇa praduṣyanti kula-striyaḥ
Strīṣu duṣṭāsu Vārṣṇeya jāyate varṇa-saṁkaraḥ

41. When unrighteousness prevails, Kṛṣṇa, the women of noble families will become corrupted; and when women are corrupted, confusion of castes will take place, O Vārṣṇeya[58].

संकरो नरकायैव कुलघ्नानाम् कुलस्य च ।
पतन्ति पितरो ह्येषां लुप्तपिण्डोदकक्रियाः ॥ ४२ ॥

Saṁkaro narakāyaiva kulaghnānām kulasya ca
Patanti pitaro hyeṣām lupta-piṇḍodaka-kriyāḥ

57. Good life is lived on earth by following the injunctions of the Vedas and the Smṛtis (canonical law-codes). While prescribing the rituals of religion and the rules of moral conduct, the scriptures lay great stress on the observance of *śiṣṭa-ācāras* (practices of virtuous and the wise) and of *kula-dharmas* (family traditions), instead of bringing everything under a common written code for all, because of the divergence of views among the several law-givers regarding the details of religious and secular conduct. (*Naiko munir-yasya matam pramāṇam mahājano yena gataḥ-sa panthāḥ* : (*M.B. Vana* 314-119)

58. Descendant of Vṛṣṇi.

42. Such confusion (of castes) surely takes to hell the destroyers of the families as well as the families destroyed. Deprived[59] of the offerings of piṇḍa and water[60], their manes fall (from their place in Pitṛ-loka)[61].

दोषैरेतैः कुलघ्नानां वर्णसंकरकारकैः ।
उत्साद्यन्ते जातिधर्माः कुलधर्माश्च शाश्वताः ॥ ४३ ॥

Doṣair–etaiḥ kulaghnānām varṇa-saṁkara-kārakaiḥ
Utsādyante jāti dharmāḥ kula-dharmāśca śāśvatāḥ

43. Through these misdeeds of the destroyers of families producing the intermingling of castes, the age-long caste-traditions and family virtues get ruined.

उत्सन्नकुलधर्माणां मनुष्याणां जनार्दन ।
नरके नियतं वासो भवतीत्यनुशुश्रुम ॥ ४४ ॥

Utsanna-kula dharmāṇām manuṣyāṇām Janārdana
Narake niyatam vāso bhavatītyanuśuśruma

44. O Janārdana, we have heard that residence in hell becomes inevitable for those men who have lost their family virtues.

59. The offspring of promiscuous alliances are spiritually disqualified for the performance of the rites for the manes. Being impure in origin, they may also ignore performing the rites or be wanting in the needed faith (*śraddhā*). In any case, the manes will not recive their due.

60. *Piṇḍa* means ball of rice : 'water' refers to *tarpaṇa*, libation of water. These constitute the ritualistic offering to the manes.

61. The world of the manes.

अहो बत महत्पापं कर्तुं व्यवसिता वयम् ।
यद्राज्यसुखलोभेन हन्तुं स्वजनमुद्यताः ।। ४५ ।।

Aho bata mahat pāpam kartum vyavasitā vayam
Yad-rājya-sukha-lobhena hantum svajanam-udyatāḥ

45. Ah, alas ! Great sin have we determined to commit—What, through coveting the sweets of royalty, we are ready to kill our kinsmen !

यदि मामप्रतीकारमशस्त्रं शस्त्रपाणयः ।
धार्तराष्ट्रा रणे हन्युस्तन्मे क्षेमतरं भवेत् ।। ४६ ।।

Yadi mām-apratīkāram-aśastram śastra-pāṇayaḥ
Dhārtarāṣṭrā raṇe hanyus-tan-me kṣema-taram bhavet

46. Should the sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra, bearing arms, slay me—unopposing and unarmed—in the war, that would confer greater felicity on me.

सञ्जय उवाच —
एवमुक्त्वाऽर्जुनः संख्ये रथोपस्थ उपाविशत् ।
विसृज्य सशरं चापं शोकसंविग्नमानसः ।। ४७ ।।

Sañjaya uvāca—

Evam-uktva(A)rjunaḥ saṁkhye rathopastha upāviśāt
Visṛjya saśaram cāpam śoka-saṁvigna-mānasaḥ

Sañjaya said—

47. Having spoken thus on the field of battle, Arjuna sank down on the seat of (his) chariot, throwing off his bow and arrows, his mind agitated by deep anguish.

इति श्रीमहाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्यां भीष्म-
पर्वणि श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु ब्रह्मविद्यायां योगशास्त्रे
श्री कृष्णार्जुनसंवादे अर्जुनविषादयोगो नाम
प्रथमोऽध्यायः

Iti Śrī Mahābhārate śata-sāhsryām saṁhitāyām Vaiyāsikyām Bhīṣma-Parvaṇi Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītāsūpaniṣatsu Brahma-vidyāyām yoga-śāstre Śrī Kṛṣṇārjuna-saṁvāde Arjuna-viṣāda-yogo nāma prathamo(a)dhyāyaḥ.

Thus, the first chapter entitled 'Yoga of the dejection of Arjuna'[62], in the Upaniṣads known as 'The Celebrated Songs of the Lord'—expounding the Knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between Śṛī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna—embodied in the Bhīṣma Parva of Śrī Mahābhārata, the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyāsa.

62. Every chapter of the *Gītā* is designated as a 'Yoga', which is best translated (with reference to the subject-matter of the *Gītā*) as 'spiritual discipline'; and in this book, metaphorically, as 'the way' in many of the succeeding chapter-headings. (Also as "knowledge" in chap. VIII and "mode" in Chap. X). XVI and XVII.)

Discipline comprises severe training in a particular mode of life in accordance with its rules; it also connotes the particular mode of approach and reaction towards the problems one is faced with, as a result of his mental training in a specific department of knowledge. We accordingly speak of the discipline of mathematics, the discipline of physical sciences, the discipline of metaphysics etc. Simiarly, here also.

The first chapter deals with the 'dejection of Arjuna', engendered by his great reluctance at having to engage in a battle in which relatives and friends would be slain; he develops a distaste for the enjoyment of worldly pleasures, such as undisputed sovereignty after vanquishing relatives-turned-enemies. Such a feeling of distaste towards worldly pleasures (*vairāgya*) is a help to spiritual advancement; it is in fact one of the four essential requisites for liberation (*sādhanā-catuṣṭaya*). Hence the dejection portrayed in the Chapter too is appropriately entitled as a 'Yoga)'.

(Yoga, of course, has the different connotation of Karma-Yoga, when the Lord differentiates between *Sāṁkhya* and *Yoga*. See II. 10. Com).

द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥

DVITIYO(A)DHYAYAḤ

(सांख्य योगः)

(*SAMKHYA YOGAḤ*)

CHAPTER II

(WAY OF KNOWLEDGE)

सञ्जय उवाच—

तं तथा कृपयाऽऽविष्टमश्रुपूर्णाकुलेक्षणम् ।

विषीदन्तमिदं वाक्यमुवाच मधुसूदनः ॥ १ ॥

Sañjaya uvāca—

Tam tathā kṛpayā(ā) viṣṭam-aśru-pūrṇākulekṣaṇam
Viṣīdantam-idam vākyam-uvāca Madhusūdanaḥ

Sañjaya said—

1. Madhusūdana addressed in these words, him (Arjuna) who was thus overpowered by compassion, whose eyes were filled with tears, and agitated, and who was dispirited—

श्रीभगवानुवाच—

कुतस्त्वा कश्मलमिदं विषमे समुपस्थितम् ।

अनार्यजुष्टमस्वर्ग्यमकीर्तिकरमर्जुन ॥ २ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān uvāca—

Kutas-tvā kaśmalam-idam viṣame samupasthitam
Anārya-juṣṭam-asvargyam-akīrti-karam-Arjuna

The Blessed Lord said—

2. Wherefrom has this dejection of spirit—so unbecoming of noble persons, barring them from heaven, and inglorious—befallen you at this perilous moment, O Arjuna ?

क्लैब्यं मा स्म गमः पार्थ नैतत्त्वय्युपपद्यते ।
क्षुद्रं हृदयदौर्बल्यं त्यक्त्वोत्तिष्ठ परन्तप ॥ ३ ॥

Klaibyam mā sma gamaḥ Pārtha naitat-tvayyupa-padyate
Kṣudram hṛdaya-daurbalyam tyaktvottiṣṭha parantapa

3. Pārtha, yield not to unmanliness; this does not befit you. Getting rid of (this) petty faint-heartedness, standup, O conqueror of enemies.

अर्जुन उवाच—
कथं भीष्ममहं संख्ये द्रोणं च मधुसूदन ।
इषुभिः प्रतियोत्स्यामि पूजार्हावरिसूदन ॥ ४ ॥

Arjuna uvāca—

Katham Bhīṣmam-aham saṁkhye Droṇam ca Madhusūdana
Iṣubhiḥ pratiyotsyāmi pūjārhāvarisūdana

Arjuna said—

4. O Madhusūdana, how shall I fight with arrows against Bhīṣma and Droṇa in battle—both of them worthy of reverence—O slayer of enemies ?

गुरूनहत्वा हि महानुभावान्
श्रेयो भोक्तुं भैक्ष्यमपीह लोके ।
हत्वाऽर्थकामांस्तु गुरूनिहैव
भुञ्जीय भोगान्रुधिरप्रदिग्धान् ॥ ५ ॥

Gurūn-ahatvā hi mahānubhāvān
śreyo bhoktum bhaikṣyam-apīha lloke
Hatvā (a)rthakamāṁstu gurūn-ihaiva
bhuñjīya bhogān-rudhira-pradigdhān

5. It were indeed far better to live in this world even on food obtained by begging, without (rather than) slaying these venerable elders; for by killing (these) elders, I shall only be enjoying here the pleasures of wealth and senses—enjoyment smeared with blood[1].

न चैतद्विद्मः कतरन्नो गरीयो
यद्वा जयेम यदि वा नो जयेयुः ।
यानेव हत्वा न जिजीविषाम-
स्तेऽवस्थिताः प्रमुखे धार्तराष्ट्राः ॥ ६ ॥

Na caitad-vidmaḥ kataran-no garīyo
yadvā jayema yadi vā no jayeyuḥ
Yāneva hatvā nā jijīviṣāmas–
te(a)vasthitāḥ pramukhe Dhārtarāṣṭrāḥ

1. Though to engage in a (righteous) war is the religious duty of a king, Arjuna takes into account only the physical result of the act (slaying venerable elders) and charges it as sinful. (Ā)

6. We do not exactly know which of the two courses[2] is preferable for us ; nor do we know whether we shall win or whether they will conquer us. Those very sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra stand facing us, slaying whom we would not wish to live.

कार्पण्यदोषोपहतस्वभावः
पृच्छामि त्वां धर्मसम्मूढचेताः ।
यच्छ्रेयः स्यान्निश्चितं ब्रूहि तन्मे
शिष्यस्तेऽहं शाधि मां त्वां प्रपन्नम् ॥ ७ ॥

Kārpaṇya-doṣopahata-svabhāvaḥ
Pṛcchāmi tvām dharma-saṁmūḍha-cetāḥ
Yacchreyaḥ syān-niścitam brūhi tan-me
śiṣyaste(a)ham śādhi mām tvām prapannam

7. With my mental condition affected by the stain of self-pity, and my mind perplexed about dharma,[3] I ask you: Ascertain and tell me that which will be meritorious for me. I am your disciple; pray instruct me, who have sought refuge in you.

2. Living upon alms, which does not involve killing others, or fighting the enemy, which is the prescribed duty. (Ā)

3. Arjuna's dilemma was this : His *sva-dharma* (ordained duty by birth) was to fight the enemy, but it involved the destruction of families and the consequential evils. Abstention from fighting and taking to mendicancy was not the (scripturally prescribed) function of a warri or, and hence it was sinful.

न हि प्रपश्यामि ममापनुद्या-
यच्छोकमुच्छोषणमिन्द्रियाणाम् ।
अवाप्य भूमावसपत्नमृद्धं
राज्यं सुराणामपि चाधिपत्यम् ॥ ८ ॥

Na hi prapaśyāmi mamāpanudyād-
yacchokam-ucchoṣaṇam-indriyāṇām
Avāpya bhūmāvasapatnam-ṛddham
rājyam surāṇām-api cādhipatyam

8. (For) I am indeed unable to visualise what (remedy) can remove the deep anguish which is withering up my senses, even if I should obtain unchallenged prosperous empire on earth or even sovereignty over the gods.

सञ्जय उवाच –

एवमुक्त्वा हृषीकेशं गुडाकेशः परन्तपः ।
न योत्स्य इति गोविन्दमुक्त्वा तूष्णीं बभूव ह ॥ ९ ॥
तमुवाच हृषीकेशः प्रहसन्निव भारत ।
सेनयोरुभयोर्मध्ये विषीदन्तमिदं वचः । १० ॥

Sañjaya uvāca—

Evam-uktvā Hriṣīkeśam Guḍākeśaḥ parantapaḥ
Na yotsya iti Govindam-uktvā tūṣṇīm babhūva ha
Tam-uvāca Hṛiṣīkeśaḥ prahasann-iva Bhārata
Senayor-ubhayor-madhye viṣīdantam-idam vacaḥ

Sañjaya said—

9. After speaking thus to Hṛṣīkeśa[4], Guḍākeśa,

4. It will be recalled that Hṛṣīkeśa and Govinda are names of one and the same person, Kṛṣṇa.

(Arjuna), the conqueror of enemies, said to Govinda, "I will not fight" and became speechless.

10. O Bhārata (*i.e.* Dhṛtarāṣṭra) ! To him who was depressed in spirits in the midst of the two armies, Hṛṣīkeśa, smiling as it were, addressed these words.[5]

Here, the text beginning from, "And then, seeing the forces of the Pāṇḍavas" (I-2) and ending with, "(Arjuna) said to Govinda, 'I will not fight' and became speechless" (II-9) should be explained as having the purpose of diagnosing the cause which produces the evils of sorrow, delusion, etc., constituting the seeds of *saṁsāra*, for sentient beings.

As for instance, in the passage beginning from, "How shall I fight against Bhīṣma and Droṇa in battle" (II-4), Arjuna exhibited (the marks of) his sorrow and delusion, caused by the feelings of affection and separation born of the false notion, "I belong to them ; and they belong to me"-in respect of empire, elders, sons, friends, well-wishers, kinsmen, relations by marriage and relations on the maternal side.

Although he had of himself entered on the war as the duty of a warrior of the Kṣatriya cast, it was surely when his discriminative faculty was overpowered by sorrow and delusion that he abstained from fighting and wished to adopt a life of mendicancy and the like, prescribed as the duty of a different cast.

In like manner, it is natural for all beings whose mind is overcome by the evils of sorrow, delusion, etc., to abandon their prescribed duties and take to those which are prohibited. Even when occupied in their own duty, their behaviour in speech, thought, deed, etc., is motivated only by the desire for fruits and is propelled by egotism[6].

5. The *Gītā*-teaching of the Lord commences only with this. Śrī Śaṅkara's Commentary also commences here.

6. The 'I' concept (sense of personality) which conceives the Self as being the agent and enjoyer. (Ā)

This being the case, by reason of the (consequent) accession of merit and demerit, *saṁsāra* characterised by the acquisition of desirable and undesirable births as well as the concomitant experience of pleasure and pain becomes never-ending. Sorrow and delusion are thus seen to be the seed of *saṁsāra*.

And their cessation cannot be encompassed except through Self-Knowledge preceded by complete renunciation of all work. Therefore, with a view to imparting it (Self-Knowledge) for the benefit of all mankind, the blessed Lord, Vāsudeva[7], using Arjuna as the instrumental cause for instruction, began His teaching with the words, "Those who should not be mourned for" (II-11).

On this subject, some (opponents) say—Beatitude cannot at all be obtained by mere devotion to (i.e., steadfast practice of) Self-Knowledge preceded by complete renunciation of all work. How then? The attainment of Beautitude is through knowledge associated with works, such as the *Agnihotra*[8] prescribed in *Śruti* and *Smṛti*[9], as is the settled import of the entire teaching of the *Gītā* gospel. As supporting this view, they cite the texts—"But if you refuse to engage in this righteous warfare" (II-33), "Your right is to work alone" (II-47), "Do you, therefore, surely, perform action" (IV-15), etc. The misgiving that Vedic ritual is productive of sin, because it is associated with killing and the like[10], should not be entertained. Why? Because, holding that war is the business and the inherent duty of the Kṣatriya and cannot therefore be unrighteous, even though it involves cruelty to elders,

7. A name of the Lord, meaning : (1) The resplendent One who resides in all, on Whom all rest, and Who covers all by Māyā ; (2) Son of Vasudeva (*V.S.* 332, 695 and 709 Com.).

8. The "works" signify the scripturally ordained acts. *Agnihotra*, fire-sacrifice is a Vedic rite ordained mainly for the Brāhmaṇa. So is righteous warfare for the Kṣatriya.

9. '*Śruti* is the revealed Vedic law ; *Smṛti* is the traditional human law based on the Vedic.

10. Such as the eating of *ucchiṣṭa* (leavings of food partaken by another) (Ā).

brothers, sons and others and is extremely pitiless, the Lord declares, concerning abstention from its performance : " then, by forfeiting your own Dharma and fame, you will be incurring sin" (II-33); and He thereby decisively asserts even at the beginning that there is no question of unrighteousness in the acts involving cruelty to animals etc. which are enjoined by *Śruti* as life-long duties.

That (what the opponents say) is wrong—for, *Jñāna-niṣṭhā* (devotion to the Path of Knowledge and *Karma-niṣṭhā* (devotion to the Path of Action) which rest on two (different) bases have been differently spoken of (by the Lord). The exposition of the supreme Truth regarding the true nature of the Self, made by the Lord in the verses from "Those who should not be mourned for" (II-11), upto " Having regard to your own Dharma, also " 'II-31), is known as (the *Jñāna*-oriented) *Sāṁkhya.* The conviction about that truth—that because the Self is devoid of the six[11] modifications such as birth etc.,It is no doer,—arising from the investigation of the purport of that section is *Sāṁkhya-buddhi* ; and those wisemen to whom it appertains are Sāṁkhyas. Before the origination of such conviction is (the Karma-oriented) *Yoga*, the performance of actions as a means of attaining Beatitude, depending on the notion that the self is distinct from the body and is doer and enjoyer and sustained by a sense of discrimination between the righteous and the unrighteous (virtue and. sin) Comprehension of this standpoint is *Yoga-buddhi* ; and the performers of action to whom it appertains are Yogins.

And so, two separate viewpoints are particularised by the Lord by the words, " This which has been declared unto you is wisdom in regard to *Sāṁkhya.* Hearken now to the wisdom of Yoga " (II-39). And of the two, He distinctively declares in the verse, " In the beginning (of creation), by Me, the embodiment of Veda " (III-3), that the devotion to *Jñāna Yoga*[12] resting on *Sāṁkhya buddhi* (wisdom of Self-realisation)is for Sāṁkhyas ; and in like manner He distinctively speaks of the devotion to Karma-Yoga resting on *Yoga-buddhi* (wisdom of Yoga) in the words,

11. See note 43, Chap. I.

12. Here ' Yoga ' is used in the general sense of ' spiritual discipline ', and not in the *Gītā*-sense of ' *Karma-yoga* ' as distinguished from *Sāṁkhya.*

"by *Karma-Yoga* (the Path of Action) for the Yogins (i.e. the active)" (III-3). In this manner, the two distinctive paths, one resting on the wisdom of Self-realisation and the other on the wisdom of (the action-oriented) Yoga, have been spoken of by the Lord Himself, seeing that Jñāna and Karma—(the former) depending on the concepts of non-agency and one-ness (of the Self), and (the latter) on those of doership and manifoldness (of selves)—cannot be related to one and the same person at the same instant.

The very same distinction mentioned here has also been made clear in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*. Having laid down the renunciation of all work by the text, " Desiring this world (the Self) alone, the Brāmaṇas having non-attachment to the worldly life become recluses " (*Br.*IV.iv-22), it says in the sequel, " What shall we achieve through children, we who have attained this world, this Self?" (*Br.* IV.iv-22). In the same *Brāhmaṇa*, it is stated that before taking a wife and after completing the enquiry into Dharma (Vedic injunction) the worldly-minded man 'desired' to secure the means of attaining the three worlds, namely son and the two-fold wealth, human and divine—the human wealth consisting of karma (work), being the means for attaining the world of *Pitṛs* (the manes), and the divine wealth being *Vidyā* (meditation, *upāsanā* constituting the means for attaining the world of the gods[13]. Thus, it has been pointed out by *Śruti* that all works, Vedic and other, pertain only to the un-enlightened man who has desires. In the words, "Renouncing them[14], they lead a life of mendicancy" (*Br.* IV. iv-22), renunciation has been prescribed for him who is devoid of desire and wishes only for the world of the Self. This separate mention would be improper if the simultaneous combination of Vedic rites and Wisdom (of the Self) had been intended by the Lord.

Nor will Arjuna's question beginning, " If it be considered by Thee that Knowledge is superior to Action " (III-1 become proper. For, how can Arjuna, by this question, falsely attribute to the Lord the doctrine of the impossibility of Knowledge and Action

13. This 'divine wealth' enabling the 'attainment of the world of gods' is also of the inferior order as contra-distinguished from the superior order of *Brahma-Vidyā* enabling the attainment of the Self-Truth, which alone is eternal liberation.

14. The three desires, for progeny, wealth and worlds of *pitr*, gods etc.

being practised by one and the same person (at the same time), which had not been previously taught (according to the opponent) by the Lord, as also the tenet of the superiority of Knowledge to works, which he had not heard of?

Moreover, if the combination of Knowledge and Action had been mentioned for all persons, it must surely have been prescribed for Arjuna also ; and, when the advice related to both the disciplines, how can the query about only one of the two—namely, "Do Thou tell me decisively that one which is the better of these two" (V-1)-arise? Surely, when, for a person desiring cure for biliousness, taking a medicine which is a mixture of both sweet and cooling ingredients has been prescribed by the physician, there cannot arise the question, "Please say which one of the two (ingredients) will bring about the cure of biliousness."

Again, if Arjuna's question (III-1, 2) be deemed to arise from his failure to understand the clear meaning of the words spoken by the Lord, even then a reply appropriate to the enquiry, should have been given by the Lord, "The combination of Knowledge and Action was taught by Me ; why are you thus deluded ?" On the contrary, it would not be reasonable to give a reply not appropriate to, and altogether beside the subject of enquiry, namely : "Two paths of devotion (steadfast practice) were taught by Me in the beginning (of creation)" (III-3).

Nor, also, would the disjunctive mention (of the two paths of the two classes of persons) and other connected statements[15] be appropriate, if a combination of Knowledge with only such action as is prescribed by *Smṛti* were intended. Moreover, the taunt (of Arjuna to the Lord) "Why then, dost Thou engage me in this terrible action?" (III-1) would be improper, knowing as he did that the act of fighting was the proper duty assigned by *Smṛti* to the Kṣatriya.

Therefore, none can demonstrate that combination of Self-Knowledge, even to the slightest extent, with action prescribed by

15. About the superiority of knowledge (III-1) ; the query in the first verse of Chap. V ; and the Lord's reply. (Ā)

Śruti or by *Smṛti* is taught in the *Gītā-Śāstra* (The Scripture of the *Gītā*)[16]

Then, there is the case of the person, who (initially) having engaged himself in action through ignorance or from motives of desire etc., (subsequently) has his mind purified by the performance of sacrificial rites, gifts, religious austerity etc.,[17] and in whom arises the knowledge concerning the supreme Truth-'' all this is One only, the Brahman, the non—agent ''-and who (thereafter), though he ceased to be attracted to action or the result of action, is seen to perform action as assiduously as he did previously, (merely) for the guidance of the world :—that seeming activity of his is not the kind of activity with which combination of Knowledge is intended (by the opponent). Just as the performance of duties of the kṣatriya by the Lord, Vāsudeva, (Himself) cannot be viewed as action to be combined with (His) knowledge as a means for attaining the end of human life (*mokṣa*), so also (is the semblance of activity) of the man of Self-Knowledge—absence of desire for fruit and of egotism being common in both cases. The knower of Truth does not think " I act'', nor does he seek for the fruit (of action).

It is like the example of a person who, (initially) desiring objects such as heaven, and having consecrated the sacred fire as a preparation for the performance of *Agnihotra* and the like which are the means of attaining the desired end, enters, upon the *Agnihotra* rite (or the like) as *kāmya-karma* (action motivated by interestedness in the result) and when the rite is half-done loses the desire for the result but nevertheless continues with the performance of the *Agnihotra* (or the like) : (in his case) the *Agnihotra* (or the like) can no longer be considered as *kāmya* (interested rite).

Accordingly, the Lord points out in various places : " though acting, he is not tainted'' (V-7) ; " (The Self) neither acts, nor is tainted ' (XIII-31).

16. See also introduction to Chap. III.

17. Vide XVIII.5. The performance of sacrificial rites, gifts, religious austerity etc. belong to the path of Action.

And, as for the statements : "(Do you, therefore, perform action) as did the ancients in olden times" (IV-15), and "Verily through (with) action alone did Janaka and others aim at (abide in) perfection" (III-20)-they should be distinguished in two ways and carefully understood.

(Question—) How is that ?

(Reply—) In case Janaka and the others knew the Truth (about the Self) already and nevertheless engaged themselves in activity, they did so for the guidance of the world, having attained perfection with the knowledge that, "*Guṇas* (as sense-organs) merely act on *Guṇas* (as objects of the senses)" (III-28). The meaning, is that though the stage of renunciation of works had been reached they attained perfection, carrying out tasks (doing action) at the same time[18]—that is, without abandoning action or works formally.

And in case they were not knowers of Truth, the passages should be interpreted as follows : By means of action dedicated to the Lord, Janaka and the others attained *saṁsiddhi* (perfection) meaning, either purity of heart or indications of the dawn of Knowledge. The Lord (also) speaks to the same effect in the passage, "Yogins perform action for the purification of the self (heart)" (V-11). Having also stated, "Worshipping Him with his own duty, a man attains perfection)" (XVIII-46), He again prescribes for such 'perfected' man the path of Knowledge in the words "How he who has reached such perfection attains to Brahman" (XVIII-50 et seq.)

Hence the conclusive purport of the *Gītā* Teaching is that salvation is attained by Knowledge of Truth alone, and not in conjunction with works. That this is the purport, we shall point out here and there in the various sections, according to the context.

Seeing no means of deliverance other than Self-Knowledge for Arjuna who was thus labouring under misconception[19] and was perplexed in mind about Dharma and immersed in the mighty ocean of sorrow, the Lord Vāsudeva, wishing to rescue him therefrom, spoke as follows, introducing him to Self-Knowledge.

18. i.e., they maintained the semblance of an active life. (Ā)

19. *Mithyā-jñānavataḥ ahaṁkāra-mamakāravataḥ*—one who associates the ideas of 'I'-ness' and 'mine-ness' with the Self. (Ā)

श्री भगवानुवाच –

अशोच्यानन्वशोचस्त्वं प्रज्ञावादांश्च भाषसे ।
गतासूनगतासूंश्च नानुशोचन्ति पण्डिताः ॥ ११ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Aśocyān-anvaśocastvam prajñā-vādāṁśca bhaṣase
Gatāsūn-agatāsūṁśca nānuśocanti paṇḍitāḥ

The Blessed Lord said—

11. You have been mourning for those who should not be mourned for. Yet you mouth the argument of wisdom.[20] The (truly) wise grieve neither for the dead nor for the living.

For those : Bhīṣma, Drona and others, *who should not be mourned for* : since they are persons of pure conduct and, in their real nature, eternal, *you have been mourning*, saying " They will die on account of me ; what shall I do with sweets of royalty, without them? '' *Yet you mouth the arguments of wisdom* i.e. the declarations of wise men. The intended meaning is : " you are displaying inconsistency in your self—showing both foolishness and wisdom—like a madcap. *The* (*truly*) *wise*, the knowers, of the Self—they, who have Paṇḍā, comprehension about the Self, in accordance with the Śruti " Having acquired wisdom, a Brāhmana should etc.''' (*Bṛ*. III. v. 1)''—, *grieve neither for the dead nor for the living.* But you have been mourning for those who are really eternal and should not be mourned for; and thus you are a fool.

(Question—) Wherefore should they not be mourned for?

(Reply—) Because they are eternal.

(Question—) How ?

20. Vide I - 31 to 44.

(Reply-)

न त्वेवाहं जातु नासं न त्वं नेमे जनाधिपाः ।
न चैव न भविष्यामः सर्वे वयमतः परम् ॥ १२ ॥

Na tvevāham jātu nāsam na tvam neme janādhipāḥ
Na caiva na bhaviṣyāmaḥ sarve vayam ataḥ param

12. There was never a time when I did not exist, nor you, nor these Kings. Nor will there ever be a time when we all shall cease to exist in the future.

There was never a time when I did not exist—(it is not that I did not exist at any time ;) but I always did exist; that is, through all the past births and deaths of the body, I have been eternally existent, like space existing in pots. In the same way, *nor* were *you* also non-existent, but you did exist. So also, *nor* were *these kings* non-existent, but they did exist. Similarly *nor* is it that *there will ever be a time when we all shall cease to exist* ; but we shall surely continue to exist, all of us, *in the future*, i.e. after the death of the present bodies ,also. The meaning is that as the Self we are eternal in all the three periods of time (past, present and future).

The use of the plural ' we ' is in conformity with the difference of bodies; and does not imply difference in the Self (i.e. does not imply existence of more than one Self).

(Question—) Now, in what manner,indeed, is the Self eternal?

(Reply—) The Lord gives an example :

देहिनोऽस्मिन्यथा देहे कौमारं यौवनं जरा ।
तथा देहान्तरप्राप्तिर्धीरस्तत्र न मुह्यति ॥ १३ ॥

Dehino(a)smin-yathā dehe kaumāram yauvanam jarā
Tathā dehāntara-prāptir-dhīras-tatra na muhyati

13. Just as childhood, youth, and old age, in this body, are (stages of experience) to the embodied soul, so also

is the attainment of another body (after death). The wise man is not perplexed thereat.

To the embodied soul i.e. the possessor of the body, *in this,* the present, *body, just as* i.e. in the same manner as *are childhood boyhood, youth,* the middle stage of being a young man, *and old age,* the stage of decay due to the loss of youthful vigour,—all these three stages being mutually different; on the disappearance of the first of these stages, there is no destruction of the soul ; nor at the rise of the second stage is there a new creation of the soul· What then? Only the attainment of the second and the third stages by the changeless, single, soul is seen; *So also is the attainment of another body,* different from the (present) body, for the same unchanging soul. *The wise man,* he who has the strength of spiritual knowledge, *is not perplexed,* does not fall into error, *thereat,* such being the truth.

Apprehending that Arjuna might question as follows : Although there is no room for any delusion as to the destruction of the soul for him who understands that the soul is eternal, we nevertheless find in everyday life confusion of understanding that the soul is subject to cold, heat, pleasure ad pain and also grief on separation from pleasure and association with pain—

The Lord said—

मात्रास्पर्शास्तु कौन्तेय शीतोष्णसुखदुःखदाः ।
आगमापायिनोऽनित्यास्तांस्तितिक्षस्व भारत ॥ १४ ॥

Mātrā-sparśāstu Kaunteya śitoṣṇa-sukha-duḥkhadāḥ
Āgamāpāyino(a)nityās-tāṁs-titikṣasva Bhārata

14. O son of Kuntī, only the contacts of the senses (with their objects) produce (the sensations of) cold and heat, pleasure and pain. They have a beginning and an end. They are impermanent (in their nature). O Bhārata, bear them patinetly.

The senses are the ear and the other organs,[21] by which sound and the other sensations are perceived. Their *contracts*, i.e. intimate union with sound and the rest, *produce* (the sensations of) *cold and heat, pleasure and pain*. Or, *contacts* mean sense-objects such as sound, which are contacted (by the senses). The senses and the contacts produce the sensations of cold etc. Cold is sometimes pleasurable and sometimes painful. So also,heat is not constant in nature. And, because 'pleasure and pain do not deviate from their constant nature, therefore they are mentioned separately from cold and heat.[22] Because *they*, the sense-contacts, *have a beginning and an end* by nature, *they are impermanent*. Therefore, *bear them patiently*, endure heat and cold and the like, i.e. do not give yourself up to joy or sorrow on their account.

(Question—) What happens to him who endures heat and cold and the like ?

(Reply—) Listen !

यं हि न व्यथयन्त्येते पुरुषं पुरुषर्षभ ।
समदुःखसुखं धीरं सोऽमृतत्वाय कल्पते ॥ १५ ॥

Yam hi na vyathayantyete puruṣam puruṣarṣabha
Sama-duḥkha-sukham dhīram so(a)mṛtatvāya kalpate

15. The wise man who remains the same in pain and pleasure, whom these cannot disturb, he alone is able, O great among men, to attain immortality.

The wise man, the man of spiritual knowledge, *who remains the same in pain and pleasure*, i.e. who does not exult in pleasure or feel dejected in pain, *whom these*, the aforesaid experiences of

21. The ear, eye, skin, tongue and nose are respectively the organs of hearing, sight, touch, taste and smell—see XV–9.

22. The external objects first produce subjective sensations such as cold and heat, felt as agreeable or disagreeable. These subjective feelings are the im mediate antecedents of pleasure and pain. (A)

cold, heat and the rest, *cannot disturb*—because of his constant perception of the eternal Self ; *he*, that person ever devoted to the constant perception of the eternal Self and bearing patiently pairs of opposites,[23] *alone is able to attain*, becomes qualified for, *immortality*, moksa.[24]

For the following reason also, it is right to endure patiently cold and heat etc., abandoning grief and delusion. For—

नासतो विद्यते भावो नाभावो विद्यते सतः ।
उभयोरपि दृष्टोऽन्तस्त्वनयोस्तत्त्वदर्शिभिः ॥ १६ ॥

Nāsato vidyate bhāvo nābhāvo vidyate sataḥ
Ubhayor-api dṛṣṭo(a)ntas-tvanayos-tattva-darśibhiḥ

16. Of the unreal, there is no existence. Of the real there is no non-existence. The conclusion about these two has been perceived by the seers of Reality.

Of the unreal, such as cold and heat, togethr with their causes, *there is no existence*, no being. Cold, and heat etc. together with their causes though perceived by the senses, are not truly existent (" vastusat "). They are only modifications; and every modification is transitory. For example, a form such as a pot, though seen by the eye, is not real, because it is not perceived apart from the clay. So also, all modification is unreal, because it is not perceived apart from its cause. Also, because before its origination and after its destruction it is not perceived,an effect such as a pot is unreal. And the cause, such as the clay, is also unreal, because it is not perceived apart from its own cause.

Objection :—It being thus unreal, the conclusion is that everything is non-existent (unreal).[25]

23. Such as heat and cold.

24. Endurance by itself may not lead to *mokṣa*, but along with discrimination and indifference to worldly objects and pleasures, (*viveka* and *vairāgya*), it becomes an effective means to Right Knowledge, which leads to *mokṣa*. (Ā)

25. The objector evidently thinks that there can be nothing which is neither a cause nor an effect. (Ā)

Reply—That is not correct. Because, at all times, we are conscious of two perceptions (*buddhi*)—the perception of the real (*sat*) and the perception of the unreal (*asat*). That in regard to which the perception does not change is real; and that in regard to which the perception changes is unreal. Thus the distinction of the real and unreal depends on the consciousness (*buddhi*). In all experiences, two perceptions are experienced by all persons in regard to the same substratum, e.g. 'a pot-existent', 'a cloth-existent', 'an elephant-existent',—not as in the perception of 'a blue lotus'[26] and so on everywhere. Of the two perceptions, that of the pot etc., is transitory, as shown previously, but not the perception of existence (is-ness). Therefore, what forms the object of 'pot'—consciousness and the like is unreal, being transitory, but what corresponds to the consciousness of 'is-ness' is not, it being unchanging.

Objection—When the pot disappears and the consciousness of the pot goes away, the prception of 'is-ness' also goes away.

Reply— No : For, the consciousness of 'is-ness' is seen in regard to cloth etc. That consciousness of 'is-ness' really has reference to the attribute (*viśeṣaṇa*).

Objection—Like the consciousness of 'is-ness', the consciousness of 'pot' is also seen with reference to another pot.

Reply—There is no similarity ; for, it (the perception of the pot) is not seen with regard to cloth etc.

Objection—Even the perception of 'is-ness' is not seen in the case of the pot which has disappeared.

Reply—It is not so (i.e. your example is not parallel) ; for, there is no substantive (*viśeṣya* i.e. the pot) present. The perception

26. In regard to 'blue lotus', two different things—''blue' the attribute (*dharma, guṇa*) and 'lotus' the substantive (*dharmi, guṇi*)—are presented to the consciousness. In regard to 'pot-existent' etc., only one thing is presented to the consciousness as in the case of illusion, e.g. a mirage. (Ā adapted).

of 'in-ness' concerns the attributive; and, any attributive being inapplicable in the absence of the substantive, (when the pot has disappeared) in respect of what can the perception of 'is-ness' arise? This is not to say that in the absence of a(real) external object, the perception of 'is-ness' cannot arise.[27]

Objection—If the substantive such as a pot be non-existent, the two-fold perception whith reference to the same substratum is illogical.[28]

Reply—Not so ; for the two-fold perception with reference to the same substratum is seen to occur even when one of the objects of perception is non-existent; as, for instance, in the case of a mirage (the consciousness) 'this is water' arises.

The conclusion is that there is no existence for the unreal-such as the body, the pairs of opposites (such as heat and cold) and their causes.

So also, *of the real*, the Self, *there is no non-existence*, because —as already stated—it is, at all times, not transitory. Thus, *the conclusion about these two*, the Self and the non-Self, the Real and the unreal,—namely, that the Real is always existent and that the unreal is always non-existent *has been perceived by the seers of Reality*, those who are habituated to perceive the "tat-tva", the real nature of That ("Tat"), a name of Brahman, the All.

The import of the passage is : You also had better follow the view of the seers of Truth and, abandoning sorrow and delusion, bear patiently the pairs of opposites such as cold and heat—some of which are constant and others inconstant (in causing pain and pleasure)—, deciding in your mind that all these phenomena are modifications (*vikāra*), in truth non-existent, and are mere false appearances like the water of the mirage.

Then, what is that which is truly real (*Sat*) and ever existent? This is being stated :

27. When we say 'here *is* no pot', 'is-ness' is perceived with reference to the place where the pot is said to be absent. (Ā)

28. The objection means this : In our experience, we see that the substantive and the attributive are equally real. Hence, here, the pot must be as real as 'is-ness'. (Ā)

अविनाशि तु तद्विद्धि येन सर्वमिदं ततम् ।
विनाशमव्ययस्यास्य न कश्चित्कर्तुमर्हति ॥ १७ ॥

Avināśi tu tad-viddhi yena sarvam-idam tatam
Vināśam avyayasyāsya na kaścit kartum arhati

16. Know for certain That, by which all this is pervaded, to be indestructible. None has the power to destroy (ruin) this Immutable.

Know for certain—by way of contrast to the unreal—*That to be indestructible*, whose nature is to be incapable of being destroyed,—that Brahman whose name is " Sat " (Existence)—*by which all this* universe, together with " ākāśa " (space) *is pervaded*—just as pots etc. by space. *This Immutable*, that which does not change, i.e. undergo increase or diminution : Brahman, whose name is " Sat ", does not-unlike the body etc.—change from its own nature, because It is without parts. Nor does It change by (being deprived of) any possessions, because nothing belongs to It, and It does not get affected in the manner Devadatta suffers loss by deprivation of his wealth. Therefore, this Immutable Brahman, *none has the power to destroy* (ruin)[29]. Nobody, not even Īśvara (the Supreme Lord) is capable of destroying (ruining) the Self. For, the Self is really Brahman itself, and no one can take action against his own Self.

Now, what is the unreal (*asat*), whose existence is not constant?

The replay is :

अन्तवन्त इमे देहा नित्यस्योक्ताः शरीरिणः ।
अनाशिनोऽप्रमेयस्य तस्माद्युध्यस्व भारत ॥ १८ ॥

29. *Vināśa* (destruction, ruin) is of two kinds—partial (*sāvaśeṣa*) and complete (*nir-avaśeṣa*). The commentary takes into account both these aspects. None can encompass the total destruction of the Immutable, because It is without parts ; nor can It be ruined in the sense Devadatta is ruined by depriving him of his wealth. (Ā). Devadatta stands for Everyman.

Antavanta ime dehā nityasyoktāḥ śarīriṇaḥ
Anāśino(a)prameyasya tasmād-yudhyasva Bhārata

18. These bodies of the embodied Self[30] the Eternal, the Indestructible, the Incomprehensible—are said to have an end. Fight therefore, O descendant of Bharata.

These bodies of the embodied Self are said by men of true knowledge *to have an end* : i.e. they are seen to undergo destruction. When the uninterrupted perception of reality in an object such as (water in) the mirage terminates as a result of investigation by means of proper testimony., then that is the end of that object. Similarly, these bodies have en end ; also just as a body seen in a dream or conjured up by magic.

'Eternal' and *'Indestructible'* are not superfluous repetitions ; for, in common life two kinds of eternality and destruction are seen. When the body, on being reduced to ashes, becomes invisible, it is said to have suffered destruction. The body, though visible on being transformed to another shape by sickness etc., is also said to have been lost. 'Eternal' and 'Indestructible' therefore denote that the Self has no connection with either kind of destruction (loss). Otherwise, the changelessness of the Self might be deemed to be like that of earth and other elements[31]; and it is to deny such an idea that both the terms 'Eternal' and 'Indestructible' have been used (by the Lord).

The Incomprehensible, that which cannot be known or determined by the recognised means of proof such as "pratyaksa" (perception by the senses).

Objection–Is not the Self determined by Revelation, and by perception etc. prior to that (Revelation)?

Reply–The objection is not tenable ; for the Self is self-determined. Only when the knower ("pramatr") himself is present,

30. Thus, the Lord asserts that there is only Self in all bodies.

31. *pariṇāmi-nityatvam.* (A), i.e. undying but always undergoing transformation.

can there be search for proofs on the part of any (would-be) knower. Verily, without first being aware of himself, 'I am such-and-such', nobody proceeds to determine (other) objects of knowledge. And, to be sure, the Self is unknown to nobody. And Scripture which is the final authority ("antyam-pramānam") derives its authoritativeness regarding the Self by (simply) serving to eliminate the superimposition (on the Self) of attributes not pertaining to It, and not as making known what is altogether unknown. The Sruti also says : "That which is directly present, not remote, Brahman, which is the Self, within all" (Bṛ. III. iv. 1).

Because the Self is thus eternal and immutable, *therefore,* do you *fight,* do not stop from fighting.

Here, it is commanded (i.e. prescribed as rule) that fighting must be done. He (Arjuna) had entered the fight already, but has kept quiet, impeded by grief and delusion. Only the removal of the impediment to what had to be carried out is done by the Lord. Therefore the word 'fight' is a mere reference to what is already known ("anuvāda") and is no (new) commandment ("vidhi")[32]

The *Gītā-Śastra* is for the removal of the cause of *saṁsāra* such as grief and delusion, and not for prompting (one) to action. To corroborate this view, the Lord quotes two Vedic verses (*Ka* II.18 &19). (and drives home the truth), "What you think : In the battle, Bhiṣma and others will be killed by me ; I myself shall be slaying them—this idea of yours is a false one". How?

य एनं वेत्ति हन्तारं यश्चैनं मन्यते हतम् ।
उभौ तौ न विजानीतो नायं हन्ति न हन्यते ॥ १९ ॥

Ya enam vetti hantāram yaścainam manyate hatam
Ubhau tau na vijānīto nāyam hanti na hanyate

32. In Mīmāṁsā, (which is one of the six chief *darśanas* or systems of philosophy, and which deals with the correct interpretation of the ritual of the Vedas and resolves the doubtful points in regard to Vedic texts), *anuvāda* means a portion of the Brāhmaṇas which comments on, illustrates, or explains a *Vidhi* or direction previously laid down and which does not itself lay down any directions.

19. He who takes the Self to be the slayer, and he who takes it to be the slain, neither of these knows. It does not slay, nor is it slain.

He who takes, understands, *the Self,* the embodied soul which is the subject under discussion, *to be the slayer*, the agent in the act of killing, *and he*, i.e. another, *who takes it to be the slain,* thinks 'I am slain', when the body is killed ; i.e. as the object of the act of killing, *neither of these knows,* i.e. has (not) understood the Self which is the object of the consciousness of 'I', through want of discrimination. The meaning is that those two, who think of the Self, 'I am the slayer' and 'I am slain', when the body is slain, are ignorant of the true nature of the Self. Because It is immutable, *It,* the Self, *does not slay,* become the agent of the act of killing nor is It slain, become the object (of that act).

How is the Self immutable? This, the second *mantra* (vedic verse) answers :

न जायते म्रियते वा कदाचि-
न्नायं भूत्वा भविता वा न भूयः ।
अजो नित्यः शाश्वतोऽयं पुराणो
न हन्यते हन्यमाने शरीरे ॥ २० ॥

Na jāyate mriyate vā kadācin—
nāyam bhūtvā bhavitā vā na bhūyaḥ
Ajo nityaḥ śāśvato(a)yam purāno
na hanyate hanyamāne śarire

20. This (Self) is never born; and never does it die (nor does it ever die) It is not that, having been, It again ceases to be. It is unborn, eternal, changeless and primeval. It is not killed when the body is killed.

This (Self) is never born : i.e. the change of state defined as birth does not occur in regard to the Self; *and never does It die–* (or

'nor' ("va") is used in the sense of 'and' ("ca"): the final transformation defined as death is hereby denied. 'Ever' ("kadācit") has to be associated with the denial of all changes, in this manner: It is never born; It never dies, and so on. *It is not that, having been* i.e. having come into being, *It again ceases to be,* attains non-existence; therefore It does not die. In worldly usage the person who, having once existed, later ceases to exist, is said to die. *It,* the Self, does not either, like the body, come into being, having been previously non-existent; therefore It is never born. As a matter of fact, that which was non-existent and then comes into existence is said to be born; but the Self is not so; hence It is not born; It *is unborn.* And, because It does not die, It is *eternal.*

Even, though, by the denial of the first and the final (of the six) modifications[33] (viz., birth and death) all modifications stand negated, nevertheless, with the intention of directly denying the intermediate changes by appropriate words of its own, the Sruti proceeds to negate all such unstated modifications, such as passage through youth, by the words 'changeless', etc. *Changeless,* always being constant: by this, the modification defined as decay ("apakṣaya") is negated. It does not diminish in form, because it has no parts; and, being devoid of all properties does not diminish by loss of any property (quality).

By "purāna", *primeval,* ever-Itself, the change defined as growth, which is the opposite of decay, is also negated. That which increases by the addition of some part is said to grow and to have become new. It, the Self, was new (fresh) in the past also (as at present), being devoid of parts, ("purā api nava eva") and is therefore "puraṇā" (ever the same); that is, It does not grow.

So also, *It is not killed,* does not get transformed, even *when the body is killed,* i.e. gets changed. To avoid '(the defect of) repetition, 'killing' (destroying) is to be taken here as meaning transformation : the Self does not change (from its natural form)

The six changes of state[34], to which all wordly objects are subject, are negated with regard to the Self, in this mantra. The

33. Vide footnote 43, Ch. I. See also footnote 34 *infra.*

34. Birth (origin), subsistence, (coming into the category of the existent), growth (through addition of particles or elements), transformation, decline

meaning of the sentence is that the Self is devoid of change of all kinds. Thus, this mantra furnishes the raison d'etre of the previous mantra which states 'Neither of these knows'.

Having declared that the Self does not became the agent or the object of the act of killing, in the mantra, "He who takes the Self to be the slayer' (II-19) and having mentioned the reason for the changelessness in the (next) verse "This (Self) is never born", the Lord concludes the declared meaning thus :-

वेदाविनाशिनं नित्यं य एनमजमव्ययम् ।
कथं स पुरूषः पार्थ कं घातयति हन्ति कम् ॥ २१ ॥

Vedāvināśinam nityam ya eṇam-ajam-avyayam
Katham sa puruṣaḥ Partha kam ghātayati hanti kam

21. The man who knows this to be indestructible, eternal, without birth, and immutable, how can he, O son of Pṛthā, cause anyone to slay or (himself) slay anyone.

The man who knows This, the Self as described in the previous mantra, *to be indestructible,* i.e. devoid of the final modification (known as death), *eternal,* devoid of change, *without birth, and immutable,* i.e. devoid of decay, *how can he,* that wise man, (himself) *slay anyone,* i.e. do the act of killing, *or cause any one to slay,* i.e. instigate somebody to be a slayer[34]. By no means does he slay anybody or cause another to slay. Both the words ('how' and 'whom' i.e. 'anyone') are intended to express denial, for it is not proper to take them as questions (calling for an answer)[35].

The sole object which the Lord desires to convey in this section is the denial of all action for the man of Wisdom ; because, the

(through detachment of particles or elements), and destruction or death ; implied by the six predicates *jāyate, asti, vardhate, vipariṇāmate, apakṣīyate nāśyati.*

35. Because no reply is given in what follows. (Ā)

reason (for the denial of the fact of slaying), viz the immutability of the Self, applies equally (to all acts) ; and the specific denial of the act of slaying is only by way of an example.

Objection–Seeing which special reason for absence of action in the case of the man of Wisdom does the Lord deny action in the words, "How can he etc."?

Reply– Why, it has already been stated that the immutability of the Self is the particular reason for the absence of all actions.

Objection–True, that has been stated ; but it is not a good reason, for the wise man is different from the immutable Self. It cannot indeed be said that there is no possibility of (any) action for the man who has knowledge of an immutable (unchangeable) pillar.

Reply– The objection is not proper ; for, the man of Wisdom is (truly, identical with) the Self. Wisdom does not pertain to the aggregate of the body etc.[36] Therefore, as the only alternative, the man of Wisdom should be the Self which remains apart from the aggregate (of body etc). and is immutable ; and because action is not possible for that wise man, the denial conveyed in the words, 'How can he, etc.' is proper. Though being ever immutable, the Self is fancied as the perceiver of objects such as sound etc. which are apprehended by the intellect etc., through ignorance caused by the failure to discriminate (the Self) from the modes of the intellect *buddhi-vṛtti*. In the same way, the Self, which is really immutable, is spoken of as *vidvān* (the man of Wisdom ; the apprehender of true Knowledge[37]) only through association with that mode of the intellect, discriminating the Self from the non-Self, known as *vidyā* (knowledge)–which (mode) is in fact unreal (from the standpoint of the Self). By stating the incompatibility of action in respect of the man of Wisdom, it is to be understood that the Lord's settled opinion is that the works prescribed by Scripture are enjoined on the un-enlightened (only).

36. Because the aggregate of body etc. is insentient.

37. The realisation 'I am Brahman' through that mode of the intellect produced on hearing (and constantly reflecting on the upaniṣadic) statement of the unity of the Brahman-Ātman. (Ā)

Objection–Knowledge also is (to be deemed as) prescribed for the unenlightened alone, because enjoining Knowledge on those who already have it would be as useless as grinding flour (over again). It is therefore inappropriate to make the distinction that works are enjoined on the unenlightened and not on the enlightened.

Reply– The objection does not hold ; because there is the distinction (respectively) of the existence and the non-existence of something to be performed (in the two cases). Works such as the *Agnihotra* constitute acts to be performed by the unenlightened, after understanding the purport of the injunctions relating to such rites and securing the several requisites thereto and with the thought, 'I am the agent ; and this act is to be done by me'. Not so does anything remain to be executed after understanding the purport of such precepts regarding the true nature of the Self as, ' This (Self) is never born' (II-20) etc. And, no other knowledge arises except that concerning the unity and the non-agency of the Self, such as 'I am not the agent ; nor am I enjoyer'. Hence, the distinction referred to is proper.

Now, for him who understands himself as ' I am the agent' there necessarily arises the thought, ' this act has to be performed by me' ; and, therefore, such a person is competent to perform (only) works ; and so, works are prescribed for him. And, he is an unenlightened man, as has been said–'Neither of these knows' (II-19).

For the superior man of Wisdom described above, action is denied by the words, 'How can he slay' (II-21). Therefore, the distinguished man of Wisdom who perceives the immutablity of the Self, as also the person desiring final emancipation, has only to renounce all works.[38] It is because of this that the Lord, Nārāyaṇa, distinguishes the two classes of persons–the Sāṁkhyas, the men of Wisdom ; and the performers of works, the unenlightened–and prescribes for them two different paths: "By *Jñāna-Yoga* for the Sāṁkhyas, by *Karma-Yoga* for the Yogins'' (III-3). And to the same effect, Bhagavān Vyaśa told his son, 'Then there are the two paths'. (*M.B. Śanti*–241-6) ; and also 'the path of action first, and subsequently renunciation'. The Lord will be referring to

38. Because works are incompatible with Wisdom ; and are adverse to emancipation, the desired end. (Ā)

this distinction frequently– e.g. "With the mind deluded by egoism, the man ignorant of Truth thinks 'I am the doer' (III-27) ; but, the knower of Truths (thinks) 'I am not acting'" (III-28) ; "Having renounced all actions by the faculty of discrimination, he rests" (V-13

Here, some pedants who fancy themselves to be learned say :–

Objection– The congnizance, "I am the immutable Self, bereft of the six modifications of birth etc. to which all wordly objects are subject, non-agent and One" can never arise for anybody, contingent on which the renunciation of all action is taught.

Reply– The objection is not valid. For, the scriptural teaching 'This (Self) is never born' (II-20) etc. will become purposeless. And the objectors may be questioned thus : Just as. through the teaching of Scripture, is produced the knowledge of the existence of dharma and adharma, and of union with another body for the doer of actions, in the same way why cannot the knowledge–of the Self being immutable, non-agent and One–be produced by Scripture? If you say, 'because the Self is beyond the reach of the organs of sense (such as mind and intellect)'–that is also not correct. Scripture proclaims,' It is perceivable by the mind alone' (*Br*. IV. iv. 19). The instrument for the perception of the Self is the mind purified by the teaching of Scripture and the Teacher, and by control of the mind[39] and of the sense - organs.[40] Thus, when inferential proof[41] and Scripture are avilable for comprehending the immutability of the Self, it is mere rashness to say that Knowledge (of the Self) cannot arise.

39. *Śama* : The resting of the mind steadfastly on its Goal (viz. Brahman) after having detached itself from the manifold sense-objects (*Viveka-Cuḍāmani*-22).

40. *Dama* : Turning both kinds of sense-organs (those of knowledge and those of action) away from sense-objects and placing them in their respective centres (*Viveka-Cuḍāmani*-23).

41. The inferential proof is as follows : Just as infancy, youth and old age are not inherent in the Self, so also modifications such as birth, death and agency are not inherent in the Self. (Ā)

It must be admitted that the knowledge which so arises-necessarily dispels ignorance which is its opposite. That ignorance has been referred to in the passages, "I am the slayer", "I am slain", "Neither of these knows" (II-19). Whereby, it is shown that the Self being considered as the (direct) agent, object and causative agent of the action of slaying, is due to ignorance. Ignorance being the cause of the idea of the agency etc. of the Self, it equally applies with regard to all actions,–because the Self is (ever) immutable. Only an agent who is subject to changes in his condition can instigate another person, who is the object of his action, to perform some act, by saying 'Do this'. The Lord denies, without any reservation, this direct and causative agency in respect of all actions alike in the case of the man of wisdom, by saying, "The man who knows This to be indestructible......how can he........slay" (II-20), just to explain that the man of wisdom has no duty to perform any action. If it be asked : 'Wherein, then, does the duty of the man of wisdom lie?', the answer has been already stated–"The path of knowledge (*Jñāna Yoga*) for the Sāṁkhyas" (III-3). And, the Lord will also declare complete renunciation of all works, in the words, "Having renounced all actions by the mind (faculty of discrimination)" etc. (V-13).

Objection–The reference being to the mind, renunciation of acts of speech and of body is not intended.

Reply– No ; because of the qualification, "all actions".

Objection–(The renunciation of) all mental actions alone is meant.

Reply– No ; since all actions of speech and of body are preceded by the working of the mind, they cannot happen in the absence of mental activity.

Objection–Then, let him renounce by mind all actions except those mental actions which cause the acts of speech and body prescribed by Scripture.–

Reply– No ; because of the qualification, "without at all acting, or causing to act" (V-13).

42. The objection is evidently of the *purva-mṃiānsaka* who held that scripturally prescribed works must never be renounced.

Objection–The renunciation of all actions herein taught by the Lord is meant for the dying person, and not for any living person.

Reply– No ; because the qualifying words, "(He) rests happily in the city of nine gates" (V-13) will then be inappropriate. Indeed, the dying man cannot be said to rest in the body by renouncing all actions.

Objection–What if the text is construed as meaning : neither acting, nor causing (others) to act, (the dying man of wisdom) deposits (all activity) in the body ;–and not as meaning that he (the man of Wisdom) rests in the body?

Reply– No ; for everywhere the immutablity of the Self is affirmed [43] (by Scripture). For the act of resting, a location is necessary ; but it is not necessary for the act of renouncing. And, the wod *'Saṁnyasya'* here (V-13) means 'having renounced' and not 'having deposited'.

Therefore, according to the *Gītā-Sastra,* the duty of the person who has Self-knowledge lies in renunciation and not in (the performance of) works. And this we shall explain in subsequent sections wherever Knowledge of the Self is spoken of.

To proceed with the topic on hand. So far, the indestructibility of the Self has been declared. Like what is it so? This is stated :

वासांसि जीर्णानि यथा विहाय
नवानि गृह्णाति नरोऽपराणि ।
तथा शरीराणि विहाय जीर्णा-
न्यन्यानि संयाति नवानि देही ॥ २२ ॥

Vāsāṁsi jīrṇāni yathā vihāya
Navāni gṛhṇāti naro(a)parāṇi
Tathā śarīraṇi vihāya jīrṇān—
yanyāni saṁyāti navāni dehi

43. Henee, the Self cannot be the agent of any action.

22. Even as a man casts off worn-out clothes, and puts on others which are new, so the embodied casts off worn-out bodies, and enters into others which are new.

Even as, in common life, *a man casts off worn-out* i.e. gone-feeble, *clothes, and puts on others which are new* i.e. quite fresh, *so,* in the very same manner, *the embodied* Self *casts off worn-out bodies, and enters into,* i.e. acquires, *others which are new.* The meaning is that the Self does not undergo any change, even as the man (who puts on a new garment after discarding the worn-out garment).

Why is the Self ever changeless? The Lord says:

नैनं छिन्दन्ति शस्त्राणि नैनं दहति पावकः ।
न चैनं क्लेदयन्त्यापो न शोषयति मारुतः ॥२३॥

Nainam chindanti śastrāṇi nainam dahati pāvakaḥ
Na cainam kledayantyāpo na śoṣayati mārutaḥ

23. This (Self), weapons cut not ; This, fire burns not ; This, water wets not ; and This wind dries not.

This, the embodied (Self), under discussion, *weapons cut not.* Because It is without parts, weapons such as the sword cannot effect division (of it) into parts. So also, *This, fire burns not.* Even fire cannot reduce It to ashes. Similarly, *This, water wets not.* The power of water consists in effecting the disjunction of the parts of a thing which is composed of parts, by moistening it ; and this cannot operate with regard to the Self which is partless. So also wind destroys matter which is moist, by drying up the moisture ; but even *the wind cannot dry up This,* the Self.

It being so, therefore–

अच्छेद्यो ऽ यमदाह्यो ऽ यमक्लेद्योऽशोष्य एव च ।
नित्यः सर्वगतः स्थाणुरचलो ऽ यं सनातनः ॥ २४ ॥

Acchedyo(a)yam-adāhyo(a)yam-akledyo(a)soṣya-
eve ca
Nityaḥ sarvagataḥ sthaṇur-acalo(a)yam sanātanaḥ

24. This (Self) cannot be cut, nor burnt, nor wetted, nor dried. changeless, all-pervading, stable, immovable This (Self) is eternal.

As the mutually destructive objects and elements (sword, fire, etc.) are incompetent to destroy the Self, therefore It is *changeless.* Because changeless, It is *all-pervading.* And because all-pervading, It is *stable,* i.e. firm as a pillar. Being firm, It is *immovable This* Self, therefore, *is eternal,* ancient, not newly produced out of any cause.

With regard to these verses (II-21 to 24), no charge of repetition can be urged on the plea that the eternal nature and changelessness of the Self have been taught in the one verse : This (Self) is never born ; nor does It ever die" (II-20), and that whatever is stated about the Self subsequently (in II-21 to 24) does not go beyond the purport of that single verse (II-20), being only verbal repetition in part and partly repetition of the import. It is because the reality of the Self is hard to understand that the Lord, Vāsudeva, introduces the topic repeatedly and defines it in different words, so that the truth which is not apparent may become comprehensible to the intellect of mortals (*saṁsārins*) and thereby bring about the termination of *saṁsāra.*

And, further—

अव्यक्तोऽयमचिन्त्यो ऽयमविकार्योऽयमुच्यते ।
तस्मादेवं विदित्वैनं नानुशोचितुमर्हसि ॥ २५ ॥

Avyakto(a)yam-acintyo(a)yam-avikāryo(a)yam-ucyate
Tasmād-evam viditvainam nānuśocitum arhasi

25. This (Self) is said to be unmanifested, unthinkable, and unchangeable. Therefore, knowing This to be such, you ought not to mourn.

This, the Self, *is said to be unmanifested,* because It is not an object comprehensible by the totality of the senses (i.e. intellect etc.). For this reason, This is *unthinkable.* That object, indeed which is perceivable by the senses, becomes an object of thought, but this Self is unthinkable, because It is not accessible to the senses; (*And*) This, the Self is *unchangeable* ; It cannot be altered in form or condition in the way milk can be done by causing it to coagulate with curd. Also, because It is without parts, It is unchangeable, Indeed, nothing which is without parts is seen to undergo change ; and because this Self cannot undergo change, It is said to be unchangeable. *Therefore, knowing This,* the Self, *to be such,* of the manner stated, *you ought not to mourn,* thinking, "I am the slayer of these people ; they are being slain by me".

Assuming the standpoint (of the commonalty), of the Self being thought to be transient, the Lord says :

अथ चैनं नित्यजातं नित्यं वा मन्यसे मृतम् ।
तथापि त्वं महाबाहो नैवं शोचितुमर्हसि ॥ २६ ॥

Atha cainam nitya jātam nityam vā manyase mṛtam
Tathāpi tvam mahabāho nainam śocitum arhasi

26. But if you should deem This to have constant birth and constant death, even in that case, O mighty-armed, you ought not to mourn thus.

The words, *'But if'* signify (that what follows is) a concession for the sake of argument. *If you should deem This,* the Self under discussion, *to have constant birth and constant death,* i.e., to be repeatedly born whenever body after body comes into being, and to be repeatedly dying whenever each (body) dies, as is commonly believed, *even in that case,* even in respect of such a Self, *O mighty-armed, you ought not to mourn thus,* because these two experiences,–death for that which has birth and birth for that which dies–are inevitable.

That being so :

जातस्य हि ध्रुवो मृत्युर्ध्रुवं जन्म मृतस्य च ।
तस्मादपरिहार्येऽर्थे न त्वं शोचितुमर्हसि ॥ २७ ॥

Jātasya hi dhruvo mṛtyur-dhruvam janma mṛtasya ca
Tasmād-apariharye(a)rthe na tvam śocitum arhasi

27. Of that which is born, death is certain: and of that which is dead, birth is certain. Over this unavoidable affair, therefore, you ought not to grieve.

Of that which is born, i.e., has acquired birth, *death is certain.* without any instance to the contrary ; *and of that which is dead, birth is certain. Therefore,* this affair designated as birth and death is unavoidable. If it is natural that death surely happens to that which has taken birth and that birth is sure to happen to that which dies, this affair becomes unavoidable. *Over this unavoidable affair, you ought not to grieve.*

Even with regard to living beings which are mere combinations of the body and the senses, it is not proper to take to mourning ; for–

अव्यक्तादीनि भूतानि व्यक्तमध्यानि भारत ।
अव्यक्तनिधनान्येव तत्र का परिदेवना ॥ २८ ॥

Avyaktādīni bhūtāni vyakta-madhyāni Bhārata
Avyakta-nidhanānyeva tatra kā paridevanā

28. All beings are unmanifested in their beginning, O Bhārata, manifested in their middle state, and unmanifested again in their end. What is there then to grieve about ?

All beings, such as sons and friends, who are in their nature mere combinations of (material elements, correlated as) the body and the senses, *are unmanifested in their beginning,* before their birth ; i.e. their origin is non-perception ("avyakta"). Having

been born, before death they are *manifested in their middle state, and unmanifested again in their end,* i.e. their end is also non-perception ; they become imperceptible after death. So has it been said: He has come from the unseen and again gone back to the unseen. He is not yours, nor are you his. What for is this meaningless grief?" (M.B.-Strī 2-13). *What is there then to grieve about,* with regard to beings who are whirling round–being unseen, (then) seen, and (again) lost (to sight)? [44]

This Self, being spoken of, is hard to understand. When the cause, namely delusion, is common to all, why should I blame you alone?

How is it that the Self is difficult to understand? The Lord says :

आश्चर्यवत्पश्यति कश्चिदेन-
माश्चर्यवद्वदति तथैव चान्यः ।
आश्चर्यवच्चैनमन्यः शृणोति
श्रुत्वाप्येवं वेद न चैव कश्चित् ॥ २९ ॥

Āścaryavat-paśyati kaścid-enam
āścaryavad-vadati tathaiva cānyaḥ
Āscaryavaccainam-anyaḥ śruṇoti
śrutvāpyevam veda na caiva kaścit

29. Some look upon This (Self) as wonderful. Others speak of It as wonderful. Others again hear of It as a wonder. And still others, though hearing, do not understand It at all.

Some look upon This, the Self, as wonderful, that is, as something like a marvel, what was never seen before, a miracle, seen all of a sudden. *Others speak of It as wonderful. Others again hear*

44. That which has no existence in the beginning and in the end must merely be illusory in the interim (*vyāvahārika-sattva*) ; and so, it should not be allowed to have any influence on the mind. (Ā)

of It as a wonder. And still others, though hearing, seeing and speaking of It, do not understand It at all.

Or, to give another interpretation–He who realises this Self is something like a wonder ; and he who speaks, as also he who learns, of It (is like a wonder). Such a person will be one in several thousand men.

The idea, therefore, is that the Self is difficult to understand.[45]

The Lord now sums up the subject-matter of this section and says :-

देहि नित्यमवध्योऽयं देहे सर्वस्य भारत ।
तस्मात्सर्वाणि भूतानि न त्वं शोचितुमर्हसि ॥ ३० ॥

Dehī nityam-avadhyo(a)yam dehe sarvasya bhārata
Tasmāt-sarvāni bhūtāni na tvam śocitum-arhasi

30. This, the Indweller in the bodies of all, is ever indestructible, O descendant of Bharata, Wherefore, you ought not to mourn for any creature.

This, the Indweller in the bodies of all, though, by Its omnipresense, abiding in all immobile and mobile bodies, *is ever,* always and in all conditions, *indestructible,* because It is part-less, and unchangeable. *Wherefore,*–because, even when the bodies of all creatures are slain, This the Indweller cannot be slain *you ought not to mourn for any creature,* such as Bhīṣma and others.

It has been stated here (II-32) that sorrow or delusion has no place from the standpoint of the Supreme Truth. Not alone from that standpoint, but also [46]—

45. (See also *Ka.* I-ii-7 and Com.) And, therefore, it is nothing peculiar that you should be mourning. (See introduction to Com. on this verse.)

46. Here the Lord presents another viewpoint which, though not valid by the spiritual utltimates, has been traditionally respected by worldly dharma, and would appeal to a hero-prince like Arjuna.

स्वधर्ममपि चावेक्ष्य न विकम्पितुमर्हसि ।
धर्माद्धि युद्धाच्छ्रेयोऽन्यत्क्षत्रियस्य न विद्यते ॥ ३१ ॥

Svadharmam-api cāvekṣya na vikampitum-arhasi
Dharmāddhi yuddhācchreyo(a)nyat-kṣatriyasya na vidyate

31. Having regard to your own Dharma also, you ought not to waver ; for there is nothing higher for a Kṣatriya than a righteous war.

Having regard to your own dharma, namely fighting, which is the inherent duty of a Kṣatriya, *also, you ought not to waver ;* it is not, proper for you to swerve from the righteous duty of a Kṣatriya which is natural to yourself ; *for* fighting being the supreme duty inseparable from righteousness and religion, because it makes for the protection of religion and the people through conquest of dominion, therefore, *there is nothing higher for a Kṣatriya than a righteous war*[47].

And. why should the fighting be done? The Lord says :

यदृच्छया चोपपन्नं स्वर्गद्वारमपावृतम् ।
सुखिनः क्षत्रियाः पार्थ लभन्ते युद्धमीदृशम् ॥ ३२ ॥

Yadṛcchayā copapannam svarga dvāram-apāvṛtam
Sukhinaḥ Kṣatriyāḥ Pārtha labhante yuddham īdṛśam

32. Only fortunate Kṣatriyas, O Pārthā, get such battle that comes accidentally, an open gate to heaven.

O Pārtha! are not those *Kṣatriyas fortunate,* who *get such a battle which comes accidentally,* i.e. unsought, *an open gate to heaven?* [48]

47. Thus, the Kṣatriya's duty is to fight in the interests of the country, the people and religion, and not to run away from battle. (Vide XVIII-43).

48. According to the *śāstrus,* a Kṣatriya who dies fighting for a righteous cause goes straight to heaven. (Ā)

Though thus shown to be your duty—

अथ चेत्त्वमिमं धर्म्यं संग्रामं न करिष्यसि ।
ततः स्वधर्मं कीर्तिं च हित्वा पापमवाप्स्यसि ॥ ३३ ॥

Atha cettvam-imam dharmyam saṁgrāmam na karisyasi
Tataḥ, svadharmam kīrtim ca hitvā pāpam-avāpsyasi

33. But if you refuse to engage in this righteous warfare, then, forfeiting your own Dharma and fame, you will be incurring sin.

But if you refuse to engage in this righteous warfare, inseparable from religion and righteousness, and enjoined by Śāstra, *then* by not engaging in the fight, *forfeiting your own Dharma and fame,* acquired by your encounters with such persons as Lord Mahādeva[49] *you shall be incurring only sin.*

Not merely forfeiture of your Dharma and fame ; but also—

अकीर्तिं चापि भूतानि कथयिष्यन्ति तेऽव्ययाम् ।
संभावितस्य चाकीर्तिर्मरणादतिरिच्यते ॥ ३४ ॥

Akīrtim cāpi bhūtāni kathayiṣyanti te(a)vyayām
Sambhāvitasya cākīrtir-maraṇād-atiricyate

34. The world also will talk of your everlasting infamy. To the honoured, disrepute is surely worse than death.

The world also will talk of your everlasting infamy, that is, it will be talked of for a very long time. *To the honoured,* to a person who has been famed as a righteous man, a hero and a man possessing

49. The reference is to the incident narrated in *Mahābharata,* where Lord Siva (Mahādeva) appeared before Arjuna in the form of a mountaineer (*kirāta*), engaged him in wrestling and, finally, pleased with his worship, bestowed on him the weapon *Pāśupata-astra.*

such noble virtues, *disrepute is surely worse than death* : to such an honoured person, death is preferable to disrepute.

What more?

भयाद्रणादुपरतं मंस्यन्ते त्वां महारथाः ।
येषां च त्वं बहुमतो भूत्वा यास्यसि लाघवम् ॥ ३५ ॥

Bhayād-raṇād-uparatam maṁsyante tvām maharathāḥ
Yeṣām ca tvam bahumato bhūtva yāsyasi lāghavam

35. The great chariot-warriors will believe that you have withdrawn from the battle through fear. And you will be lightly spoken of by those who have hitherto held you in high esteem.

The great chariot-warriors[50], beginning from Duryodhana, *will believe that you have withdrawn from the battle through fear* of Karṇa and others, and not through compassion. Who are they that will think so? Duryodhana and others, *by whom you have been hitherto held in high esteem* as possessing many praiseworthy qualities. Having been so esteemed, *you will* further *be lightly spoken of by them.*

Moreover,

अवाच्यवादांश्च बहून्वदिष्यन्ति तवाहिताः ।
निन्दन्तस्तव सामर्थ्यं ततो दुःखतरं नु किम् ॥ ३६ ॥

Avācya-vādāṁśca bahūn-vadiṣyanti tavāhitāḥ
Nindantas-tava sāmarthyam tato duhkha taram nu kim

36. And, your enemies, cavilling at your prowess, will say many things that are not to be uttered. What could be more painful than that ?

50. See note 9, Chap. I.

And, your enemies, cavilling at, talking contemptuously of, *your prowess,* proved in battles with the Nivāta-kavacas[51] and others. *will say many things,* in manifold words, *that are not to be uttered. What could be more painful than that,* the agony caused by such abuse?—meaning there cannot be any agony more unbearable than that.

On the contrary, when engaging Karṇa and others in battle—

हतो वा प्राप्स्यसि स्वर्गं जित्वा वा भोक्ष्यसे महीम् ।
तस्मादुत्तिष्ठ कौन्तेय युद्धाय कृतनिश्चयः ॥ ३७ ॥

Hato vā prāpsyasi svargam jitvā vā bhokṣyase mahīm
Tasmād-uttiṣṭha Kaunteya yuddhāya kṛta-niścayaḥ

37. Dying, you gain heaven ; conquering, you enjoy (sovereignty of) the earth. Therefore, O son of Kunti, arise, resolved to fight.

Dying, you gain heaven. Conquering Karṇa and other heroes, *you enjoy* (sovereignty of) *the earth.* In either case, there will be worthy gain for you. Because it is so, *therefore, O son of Kunti, arise, resolved to fight,* that is, making the resolution, "I will conquer the enemies, or die".

For you who must fight regarding warfare as your duty, this is the advice (I offer). Listen :

सुखदुःखे समे कृत्वा लाभालाभौ जयाजयौ ।
ततो युद्धाय युज्यस्व नैवं पापमवाप्स्यसि ॥ ३८ ॥

Sukha duhkhe same kṛtvā lābhālābhau jayājayau
Tato yuddhāya yujyasva naivam pāpam-avāpsyasi

51. See note 37, Chap. I.

38. Treating alike pleasure and pain, gain and loss, conquest and defeat, do you then engage in battle. So, shall you incur no sin.

Treating alike pleasure and pain, i.e. without attachment (to the one) or aversion (to the other) ; so also, treating alike *gain and loss,* and *conquest and defeat, do you then engage in battle. So,* fighting in this manner, *shall you incur no sin.*

This instruction is only incidental, in strict keeping with the context. [52]

In the verses, "Having regard to your own Dharma also" etc. (II-31 to 38), the argument for discarding the feelings of sorrow and embarrassment, based on worldly considerations, has been stated ; but it is not the ultimate object intended. On the other hand, the subject taken up is the exposition of the supreme Truth (II-12 et seq). And this, which has been treated of already (II-20 to 25), is now concluded in the following verse, with a view to teaching the (two-fold) division of the subject of the Śāstra. For, by making such a division of the subject of the Śāstra here, the scriptural teaching concerning the two paths later on, "By *Jñāna-Yoga* for the Sāṁkhyas and by *Karma-Yoga* for the Yogins" (III-3), will proceed the more easily ; and the listeners also will grasp it the more easily as relating to different subjects. So, the Lord says–

एषा ते ऽभिहिता सांख्ये बुद्धिर्योगे त्विमां शृणु ।
बुद्ध्या युक्तो यया पार्थ कर्मबन्धं प्रहास्यसि ॥ ३९ ॥

Eṣā te(a)bhihitā sāṁkhye buddhir-yoge tvimām śruṇu
Buddhayā yukto yayā Pārtha karma-bandham prāhsyasi

52. This observation is for dispelling a possible doubt that the *Gītā-śāstra* expounding the supreme Truth enjoins the conjunction of works (with Knowledge). (Ā)

39. This which has been declared unto you is wisdom in regard to Sāṁkhya. Hearken now to the wisdom of Yoga, endowed with which, O son of Pṛthā, you shall break through the bond of karma.

This which has been declared unto you is wisdom (*buddhi*) *in regard to Sāṁkhya,* the true knowledge of the Supreme Reality, which directly terminates the evil[53] which is the cause of saṁsāra, (characterised by) sorrow and delusion, etc.[54] *Hearken now to the wisdom,* which is about to be told, *of Yoga,* which is the means of attaining Sāṁkhya-buddhi. Its aim is the worship of Iśvara through Karma-Yoga, the performance of works without attachment, and samādhi-yoga (meditation), preceeded by the abandonment of the pairs of opposites (like pleasure and pain).

The Lord praises the wisdom of Yoga[55] for stimulating (Arjuna's) interest : *Endowed with which,* (wisdom) concerning Yoga, *O son of Pṛthā, you shall break through the bond of karma :* karma itself, called by the names of dharma and adharma (virtue and sin) is the bond ; and the breaking of the bond by attaining the Knowledge (of the Self) is to be brought about by Iśvara's grace.

What is more—

नेहाभिक्रमनाशोऽस्ति प्रत्यवायो न विद्यते ।
स्वल्पमप्यस्य धर्मस्य त्रायते महतो भयात् ॥ ४० ॥

Nehābhikrama-nāśo(a)sti pratyavāyo na vidyate
Svalpam-apyasya dharmasya trāyate mahato bhayāt

40. In this, there is no waste of the unfinished effort, nor is there the production of contrary results,

53. Ignorance of the nature of the Self. (Ā)

54. Attachment (*rāga*) and aversion (*dveṣa*), concepts of being an agent and enjoyer (*kartṛtva, bhoktṛtva*), and the like. (Ā)

55. i.e., the discipline of performing works disinterestedly and with sense of dedication to Iśvara, which goes by the name *Karma-yoga*.

Even a very little of this Dharma saves (one) from the great terror.

In this, the path of mokṣa by means of karma-yoga, *there is no waste of the unfinished effort ;* that is, for a commencement made in the path of Yoga, there is no uncertainty concerning the result, as in agriculture [56] and the like; *nor is there the production of contrary results,* as in medical treatment[57]. What else happens? *Even a very little of this Dharma,* practised in this path of Yoga, *saves one from the great terror* of saṁsāra, characterised by birth and death.

The wisdom concerning Sāṁkhya, spoken of, and that concerning Yoga, which will be described hereafter, is of the following characteristic :

व्यवसायात्मिका बुद्धिरेकेह कुरुनन्दन ।
बहुशाखा ह्यनन्ताश्च बुद्धयोऽव्यवसायिनाम् ॥ ४१ ॥

Vyavasāyātmika buddhir-ekeha Kurunandana
Bahu-śākha hyanantāśca buddhayo(a)vyavasāyiṇam

41. In this, O scion of Kuru, there is but a single one-pointed determination. The purposes of the irresolute are many-branched and innumerable.

In this, the path to Beatitude, *O scion of Kuru, there is but a single one-pointed determination,* i.e. of a resolute nature. It is inimical to other many-branching purposes (thoughts) opposed to it, because it arises from the proper source of knowledge (pramāṇa) Those other thoughts opposed to it, on the other hand, cause the endless, shoreless and unceasing saṁsāra to become

56. Where a good harvest cannot be had if the sequence of efforts such as ploughing, watering, sowing, transplanting etc are not perfectly fulfilled.

57. e.g., a medicine wrongly administered bringing about calamitous consequences.

ever-spreading and extensive, by functioning in their diversely branching ways ; and, (only) when such diversified thoughts are brought to an end through the power of discrimination produced by the (proper) source of knowledge, will saṁsāra also cease. *These* (*other*) *purposes* (objects, thoughts) *are many-branched,* i.e. diversified ; and, indeed, by reason of the variety in each branch, *innumerable*–Of whom?–*Of the irresolute,* (the undecided), those bereft of the discrimination produced by the (proper) source of knowledge.

About those who do not possess one-pointed determination[58]—

यामिमां पुष्पितां वाचं प्रवदन्त्यविपश्चितः ।
वेदवादरताः पार्थ नान्यदस्तीति वादिनः ॥ ४२ ॥
कामात्मानः स्वर्गपरा जन्मकर्मफलप्रदाम् ।
क्रियाविशेषबहुलां भोगैश्वर्यगतिं प्रति ॥ ४३ ॥
भोगैश्वर्यप्रसक्तानां तयापहृतचेतसाम् ।
व्यवसायात्मिका बुद्धिः समाधौ न विधीयते ॥ ४४ ॥

Yāmimam puṣpitām vācam pravadantyavipaścitaḥ
Vedavāda-ratāḥ Pārtha nānyadastīti vādinaḥ
Kāmātmānaḥ svarga-parā janma-karma-phala-pradām
Kriyā viśeṣa-bahulām bhogaiśvarya-gatim prati
Bhogaiśvarya-prasaktānām tayāpahṛta cetasām
Vyavasāyātmikā buddhiḥ samādhau na vidhīyate

42-44. O Pārtha, those who teach this flowery speech are unwise. Taking pleasure in the panegyric words

58. The description of "those" hereupon conforms to that of the *karmins* of the *purvamīmāṁsa* school, who perform the religious works of the vedas, with the expectation of reward, such as the impermanent residence in heaven.

of the Vedas,[59] they declare that there is nothing else. They are full of desires and look upon heaven as their highest goal. (Their teaching, this flowery speech) offers (new) birth as the reward of works and exuberantly describes various specific rites as the means to pleasure and power. In the minds of those who are deeply attached to pleasure and power and whose discrimination is carried away by that (teaching) no set determination can be formed.

O Partha, those who teach this—that which is presently being stated-*flowery speech,* fine like a tree in bloom and pleasant to hear, *are unwise,* are men of mean intelligence, wanting in discrimination. *Taking pleasure in the panegyric words of the Vedas,* i.e. delighting in the Vedic passages expressing many eulogies (about gods and Vedic rites) and the fruits and means (to those rites), *they* are habituated to *declare that there is nothing else* than works, which are the means for obtaining heaven (svarga) and other rewards.

They are also *full of desires :* they are by nature desirous of enjoyments and are intent on their pursuit, *and look upon heaven as their highest goal,* holding it as the principal and highest object of of human achievement. Their teaching, the flowery speech referred to, *offers* (new) *birth as the reward of works and exuberantly describes various specific rites,* with svarga (heaven), cattle, progeny and the like as the objects to be secured *as the means to,* i.e. for obtaining, *pleasure and power.* Thus indulging in profuse talk about diverse rites, those fools go round and round in Saṁsāra.

59. The Vedas in their *Karma-Kāṇḍa,* do eulogise the *Karmas* that endow only ephemeral rewards of wordly pleasures and well-being. But their purpose in such eulogising is only to induce the down-to-earth people to come under some regulatory discipline through these rituals, which if they pursue with the yearning to further the true purport and purpose of the vedas would gradually lead them to those culminating portions of the vedas, known as *Jñāna-Kānda,* viz, the upaniṣads, prescribing the Path of Knowledge. But the *Karmins,* the Lord refers to, have no such yearning and stop with the evanascent fruits of the vedic Karmas as the very end of life.

In the mind (samādhi–buddhi–antaḥ-karaṇa, the inner faculty), that in which all objects of enjoyment for the puruṣa (individual) soul) are deposited, *of those that are deeply attached to pleasure and power,* i.e. of those who espouse pleasure and power, holding them to be objects for fulfilment, and identify themselves with them, *and whose discrimination is carried away,* i.e. whose judgement and wisdom is covered up, *by that* teaching, which exuberantly describes various rites, *no set determination,* wisdom concerning Sāṁkhya or Yoga, *can be formed,* will arise.

The Lord states what consequence accrues to those (the above-mentioned) devoid of judgement and wisdom and (who) are full of desires–

त्रैगुण्यविषया वेदा निस्त्रैगुण्यो भवार्जुन ।
निर्द्वन्द्वो नित्यसत्त्वस्थो निर्योगक्षेम आत्मवान् ॥ ४५ ॥

Traiguṇya-viṣayā vedā nistraiguṇyo bhavārjuna
Nir-dvandvo nitya-sattvastho nir-yogakṣema ātmavān

45. The Vedas deal with the three *Guṇas*. Be you, O Arjuna, free from the triad of the *Guṇas,* free from the pairs of opposites, ever-abiding in *Sattva,* free from (the thought of) getting and keeping, and (be you) self-possessed.

The Vedas[60] *deal with the three Guṇas,* i.e. Saṁsāra, which is the effect of the three Guṇas, is the subject-matter expounded by

60. The reference is only to the *Karma-kāṇḍa* of the vedas (which is the scripture of the unawakened persons referred to in verses 42 to 44). The *Jñāna-kāṇḍa* of the same vedas constitute the scripture of the awakened-persons thrading the Path of Knowledge, who do not consider the *Karma-Kāṇḍa* (ritualistic portion) as the end is itself (as is done by the unawakened), but take it as the means of purifying the mind of the unawakened and thus qualifying them too for the Path of Knowledge, when these Karmas are performed disinterestedly and dedicated to God.

them.[61] But, *you,O Arjuna,* should *be free from the triad of the Guṅas,* i.e., be devoid of desires ; *free from the pairs of opposites,* the mutually opposed objects which are the causes of pleasure and pain ; *ever-abiding in Sattva,* always practising Sattva (goodness or purity) ; *free from* (*the thought of*) *getting and keeping :* getting ("yoga") is acquisition of what has not been acquired, and keeping ("kṣema") is preservation of what has been already acquired. Effort in the path of virtue is difficult for him who considers getting and keeping as the most important thing ; therefore do you become free from the thoughts of getting and keeping ; *and self-possessed,* i.e. be vigilant.[62] This is the advice for you in the performance of your duty.

Question–If the innumerable rewards of all the rituals prescribed by the Vedas are not to be desired, why should those rituals be performed dedicating them to Īśvara?

Answer–Hear what folllows :

यावानर्थ उदपाने सर्वतः संप्लुतोदके ।
तावान्सर्वेषु वेदेषु ब्राह्मणस्य विजानतः ॥४५॥

Yāvān-artha udapāne sarvataḥ samplutodake
Tāvan-sarveṣu vedeṣu brāhmaṇasya vijānataḥ

46. What use there is in a reservoir when there is all-spreading flood, so much use is in all the Vedas to the Brāhmaṇa who has known the Self.

61. *Saṁśara* is the aggregate of virtuous, sinful and mixed actions and their results, brought about by the three Guṇas. (Ā)

62. For becoming free from the triad of Guṇas (i.e. *saṁsāra*), getting away from the pairs of opposites is the means ; and for the latter, constant practice of *sattva-guṇa* is the means. Such practice is difficult for one who is obsessed with the thought of getting and keeping ; and freedom from such thought is to be obtained through self-possession (i.e. vigilance)–keeping the mind out of the sway of sense-objects. (Ā)

In common experience, *what use there is*–the extent of utility that there is for bathing, drinking, etc.–*in a reservoir,* a limited source of water like a well, a tank and such others, that utility in its entirety is accomplished by the *all-spreading flood,* i.e. the former is contained in the latter. *Similarly, so much use is in all the Vedas,* to that extent is available the fruit of all rituals ordained in the Vedas, *to the Brāhmaṇa who has* renounced the world and *known the Self,* the truth of the Supreme Reality, and secured the fruit of Knowledge, corresponding to the all-spreading flood. The fruit obtainable by all Vedic rituals is thus contained in the latter. [63] The Śruti says–"He who knows what (Brahman) he (Raikva) knows, possesses all that good whatever that is done by people, (even as the winner with the highest throw of dice possesses all the lowest throws)" (Ch. IV-i-4); and the Lord also says–"All action in its entirety (attains its consummation in knowledge)" (IV-33).

Therefore, rituals, even though they stand simply in the place of (the limited) well, tank, etc., (and not the unlimited flood) must be performed by the man who is qualified for works, before he becomes qualified for taking to the path of Knowledge. [64]

And, as for you—

कर्मण्येवाधिकारस्ते मा फलेषु कदाचन ।
मा कर्मफलहेतुर्भूर्मा ते सङ्गोऽस्त्वकर्मणि ॥ ४७ ॥

Karmaṇyevādhikāraste mā phaleṣu kadācana
Mā karma-phala-hetur-bhūr-mā te saṅgo (a) stvakarmaṇi

47. Your right is to work alone ; but never to the fruits thereof. Be you not the producer of the fruits

63. The limited happiness securable by rituals is comprehended in the infinite Bliss which is Brahman, the Self. (*Bṛ*. IV-iii-32). (Ā). See also *Tait.* II. 1. Com.

64. The path of Karma-Yoga leads to final beatitude in the end and hence it is not futile. (Ā). See also the Introduction.

of (your) actions ; neither let your attachment be towards inaction.

Your right is to work alone : you are qualified for action alone and not for the path of Knowledge. And, even when doing work, *never to the fruits thereof.* Under no circumstances whatever, let there be desire for the result of action. If there be desire for the fruit of action, then you will become the producer of the fruit of action ; in that way, *be you not the producer of the fruits of (your) actions.* When a man enters on action with the desire for its fruit, then he becomes the producer of (another) birth as the fruit of action. *Neither let your attachment be towards inaction :* do not become fond of remaining inactive, thinking, "if the fruit of action is not desirable, what is the necessity for work, which is thus disagreeable?"

If action is not to be performed prompted by its result, then, how should it be done? This is now stated–

योगस्थः कुरु कर्माणि सङ्गं त्यक्त्वा धनञ्जय ।
सिद्ध्यसिद्ध्योः समो भूत्वा समत्वं योग उच्यते ॥ ४८ ॥

Yogasthaḥ kuru karmāṇi sangam tyaktvā Dhanañjaya
Siddhayasiddhayoḥ samo bhūtvā samatvam yoga ucyate

48. Being steadfast in Yoga, O Dhanañaya, perform actions, abandoning attachment, remaining unconcerned as regards success and failure. This evenness of mind (in regard to success and failure) is known as Yoga.

Being steadfast in Yoga, O Dhanañjaya, perform actions, solely as dedication to Iśvara ; and even there, *abandoning* (the) *attachment,* (in the thought) "may Īśvara be pleased". 'Success' means the attainment of Knowledge, arising from the purification of the

mind (sattva) by performing action without desire for the result ; and 'failure' is what arises from the contrary[65] Do you perform actions, *remaining unconcerned as regards success and failure,* being equanimous both in success and failure. What is this Yoga, steadfast in which action is to be performed. It is this : *evenness of mind* in success and failure *is known as Yoga.*

Compared to the action which is performed with evenness of mind, as dedicated worship to the Lord–

दूरेण ह्यवरं कर्म बुद्धियोगाद्धनञ्जय ।
बुद्धौ शरणमन्विच्छ कृपणाः फलहेतवः ॥ ४९ ॥

Dūreṇa hyavaram karma buddhi yogād Dhanañjaya
Buddhau ṣaranam-anviccha kṛpaṇāḥ phala hetavaḥ

49. Work (with desire) is verily far inferior to that performed with evenness of mind, O Dhanañjaya seek refuge in this evenness of mind. Wretched are they who act for results.

Work done by a person seeking for its fruit *is verily far inferior to*–i.e. it is far removed from, vulgar, and lower than, *that performed with evenness of mind,* (the former) being productive of birth and death, *O Dhanañjaya.* Wherefore, *seek refuge,* asylum which affords freedom from fear, in this evenness of mind, i.e. in the wisdom of Yoga, or in what arises from its[66] ripening–in the wisdom of Sāṁkhya. That is to say, seek refuge in the knowledge of the Supreme Reality. For, *wretched,* i.e. miserable, *are they who act,* perform such inferior, action, *for results,* prompted by the desire for the fruit. The Śruti says : "O Gārgi, he who departs from this world without knowing this Akṣara is a wretch" (Br. III-viii-10).

65. Meeting with ignorance which arises from the impurity of the mind. (Ā)

66. 'It' refers to work performed with evenness of mind. Its ripening (fruit) is purification of the intellect. (Ā). From the last is born *Sāṁkhya-buddhi*

Hear what gain is obtained by one who performs his duty with evenness of mind :

बुद्धियुक्तो जहातीह उभे सुकृतदुष्कृते ।
तस्माद्योगाय युज्यस्व योगः कर्मसु कौशलम् ॥ ५० ॥

Buddhi yukto jāhatīha ubhe sukṛta-duṣkṛte
Tasmād-yogāya yujyasva yogaḥ karmasu kauṣalam

50. Endued with this evenness of mind, one casts off here both virtue and vice[67]. Devote yourself, therefore, to this Yoga. Yoga is skill in action.

One who is *endued with this even-ness of mind, casts off here,* in this world, *both virtue and vice* (puṇya and pāpa), through purification of mind and attainment of Knowledge. *Therefore, devote yourself to,* exert yourself for, *this Yoga,* equanimity of mind. For, *Yoga is* verily *skill in action* (the principle of dexterity of work). The mental equanimity, in regard to success and failure, of him, who engages in work which is his own duty (svadharma), with his mind dedicated to Īśvara, is the secret of dexterity (of work). It is surely the secret of dexterity, because even works which are of the nature of bondage cease to be so (lose their power to bind), by the efficacy of mental equanimity. Therefore, become endowed with evenness of mind.

For,–

कर्मजं बुद्धियुक्ता हि फलं त्यक्त्वा मनीषिणः ।
जन्मबन्धविनिर्मुक्ताः पदं गच्छन्त्यनामयम् ॥ ५१ ॥

67. *sukṛta* means both virtuous deed and its result, *puṇya* (religious merit) ; and *duṣkṛta* means both bad action and its result, *pāpa* (sin).

Karmajam buddhi yuktā hi phalam tyaktvā
manisīṇah
Janma-bandha-vinirmuktāḥ padam
gacchantyanāmayam

51. Those endued with evenness of mind abandon the fruit of action ; possessed of knowledge (and) freed from the fetter of birth, they go to that state which is beyond evil.

Those endued with even-ness of mind (buddhi) *abandon the fruit of action*, i.e. the acquisition of desirable and undesirable bodies (good and bad births). *Possessed of knowledge* (and) *freed from the fetter of birth* : birth itself is the fetter,–even when alive they are freed from the fetter of birth ;–*they go to that state* known as mokṣa, release, the supreme state of Viṣṇu, *which is beyond evil*, free from all turmoils.

Or, the 'buddhi' referred to in the passage beginning from 'buddhi yogāt' (II-49) can be taken to be the (Sāṁkhya) wisdom, the knowledge of the Supreme Reality,–corresponding to the all-spreading flood (vide supra II-46)–which arises on the purification of the mind through the practice of Karma-yoga ; because, it is stated that it is the direct cause of the destruction of virtue and vice (II-50).

When is that Knowledge, which arises on the purification of the mind through the practice of Karma-yoga, attained ? The answer follows :

यदा ते मोहकलिलं बुद्धिर्व्यतितरिष्यति ।
तदा गन्तासि निर्वेदं श्रोतव्यस्य श्रुतस्य च ॥ ५२ ॥

Yadā te mohakalilam buddhir-vyatitariṣyati
Tadā gantāsi nirvedam śrotavyasya śrutasya ca

52. When your intellect crosses beyond the mire of delusion, then shall you attain to indifference regarding what has yet to be heard and what has been heard.

When, at the instant at which, *your intellect crosses beyond the mire of delusion :* delusion in the form of ignorance fouls the intellect ; and thereby the intelligence that discriminates between the Self and the non-Self is muddled and the mind (antaḥ-karaṇa) is turned towards the objects of the senses. The meaning is : When your intellect attains to the state of purity, then, at that moment, *shall you* attain to indifference, i.e. aversion (vairāgya), *regarding what has yet to be heard and what has been heard* [68] i.e. they will be understood to be of no value.

If you ask, "When shall I attain to the supreme Yoga, the fruit of Karma-yoga, by crossing beyond the slough of delusion and obtaining wisdom brought about by discrimination of the Self?", listen :

श्रुति विप्रतिपन्ना ते यदा स्थास्यति निश्चला ।
समाधावचला बुद्धिस्तदा योगमवाप्स्यसि ॥ ५३ ॥

Śruti-vipratipannā te yadā sthāsyati niścalā
Samādhāvacalā buddhis-tadā yogam-avāpsyasi

53. When your intellect–bewildered by what you have heard– has become steady and firmly established in the Self, then shall you attain Yoga.

When, at the instant, *your intellect* (buddhi–antaḥ-karaṇa)–*bewildered by what you have heard,* (through Scripture), regarding activity (pravṛtti) and abstention from work (nivṛtti), and disclosing the various ends, means and their relations, and having understood them in mutually differing ways and been thereby perplexed,–*has become steady,* unmoved (in concentration), deprived

68. except the teachings of Scripture regarding the Self. (Ā)

of such distracting movement, *and firmly established in the Self* (Samādhi – Ātman), wherein the mind (cittam) is firmly rested, and therein, also, without indecision, *then,* at that moment, *shall you attain Yoga,* i.e. Samādhi, the discernment arising from discrimination.

Finding an opportunity for questioning, and, desirous of knowing the distinctive marks (*lakṣaṇa*) of a person who has attained discernment in *Samādhi* (*Samādhi-Prajña :* discernment in Self-absorption), –

अर्जुन उवाच —

स्थितप्रज्ञस्य का भाषा समाधिस्थस्य केशव ।
स्थितधीः किं प्रभाषेत किमासीत व्रजेत किम् ॥ ५४ ॥

Arjuna uvāca

Sthita-prajñasya kā bhāṣā samādhisthasya Keśāva
Sthitadhīḥ kim prabhāṣeta kim-āsita vrajeta kiṃ

Arjuna asked -

54. What, O Keśava, is the description of the man of established wisdom, merged in Samādhi? How does the man of established wisdom speak, how sit, how walk?

What, O Kesava, is the description of the man, i.e. how is he described by others, *of established wisdom,* he who has the wisdom, "I am the Supreme Brahman", firmly established in him, and who is *merged in Samādhi*? And, *how does the man of established wisdom* himself, *speak? how sit, how walk?*

In this verse, Arjuna enquires about the distinctive marks of the man of established wisdom.

To the person who has taken to the discipline of devotion to knowledge (*jñāna-yoga-niṣṭhā*) by renouncing works from the very

beginning[69], and also to him who has reached that stage (of embarking on that discipline) through devotion to the path of Action (Karma-yoga),–to them both, the distinctive marks of the man of established wisdom are taught, together with the means (of obtaining that wisdom), in the passage from "When a man completely casts away" (vide infra–II-55) to the end of the Chapter. Indeed, everywhere, in the Scripture concerning the Supreme Self, the distinctive marks of the successful practician (i.e. the realised sage) are alone taught as the means (of reaching that stage of realisation), because they are to be established (in the practician under view by (his own) effort. The Lord now specifies these, which are to be adopted as the means and established by effort, and which (finally) become the marks (of the man of realisation).

श्री भगवानुवाच —

प्रजहाति यदा कामान्सर्वान्पार्थ मनोगतान् ।
आत्मन्येवात्मना तुष्टः स्थितप्रज्ञस्तदोच्यते ॥ ५५ ॥

Srī Bhagavān uvāca

Prajahāti yadā kamān-sarvān-artha manogatān
Ātmanyevātmanā tuṣṭah sthita-prajañas tadocyate

The Blessed Lord said –

55. When a man completely casts away, O Pārtha, all the desires of the mind, satisfied in the Self alone by the Self, then is he said to be one of established wisdom.

When, at the instant, *a man completely casts away, O Pārtha, all the desires*, abandons the various kinds of wishes in their entirety *of the mind*, i.e. (wishes) which had entered his mind, i.e. the heart, (then is he he said to be one of established wisdom). To remove

69. i.e. in *brahmacarya* (Ā), the very first of the four stages of life. (Vide note 12, Introduction.)

the doubt that on the abandonment of all desires, there being nothing from which to get satisfaction while the cause which produced the embodied state would continue to operate, such a person would behave like a mad man or a drunkard, it is said : *satisfied in the Self,* in his innermost Self (pratyagātman) *alone by the Self,* his own Self, without desiring any acquisition external to himself, and with the conviction that all else is of no use – being satisfied with the ambrosia, viz., the realisation of the Supreme Truth–, *then is he said to be one of established wisdom,* a wise man (vidvān), one whose wisdom arising from the discrimination of the Self and the non-Self has become steadfast. The meaning is that he is a man of steady wisdom who has abandoned all desire concerning progeny, wealth and the worlds, and renounced all activity (saṁnyāsin) and delights in the Self and sports in the Self (Ch. VII-xxv-2).

Moreover,

दुःखेष्वनुद्विग्नमनाः सुखेषु विगतस्पृहः ।
वीतरागभयक्रोधः स्थितधीर्मुनिरुच्यते ॥ ५६ ॥

Duhkhesvanudvigna-manāḥ sukheṣu vigata-spṛhaḥ
Vīta-rāga-bhaya-krodhaḥ sthitadhīr-munir-ucyate

56. He, whose mind is not afflicted by adversities, who does not hanker after pleasures, who has become free from attachment, fear and wrath, is said to be a *muni*, of steady wisdom.

He, whose mind is not afflicted, not shaken, on being visited by adversities[70], such as distress of the body (ādhyātmika); and also,

70. Adversities are of three kinds : *ādhyātmika*, arising in the body, such as fever, head-ache etc ; *ādhi bhautika*, arising from external objects, such as tiger, serpent, etc ; and *ādhi daivika*, arising from act of God or fate, such as storm, rain, etc.

Pleasures are also of the same three kinds. (Ā)

who does not hanker after pleasures, i.e. on getting pleasures (i.e. pleasurable objects) he has no longing for them : his longing for pleasure does not increase – unlike fire (which increases) on receiving fuel ; *who has become free from attachment, fear and wrath,* from whom all attachment, fear and wrath have departed, *is said to be a muni,* a saṁnyāsin, one who has renounced works, (a man) *of established wisdom.*

Moreover,

यः सर्वत्रानभिस्नेहस्तत्तत्प्राप्य शुभाशुभम् ।
नाभिनन्दति न द्वेष्टि तस्य प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठिता ॥ ५७ ॥

Yaḥ sarvatrānabhisnehas-tattat-prāpya
śubhāśubham
Nābhinandati na dveṣṭi tasya prajñā pratiṣṭhitā

57. He who is everywhere unattached, not delighted at meeting with good nor vexed at (meeting with) evil, his wisdom becomes fixed (established).

He, the muni, *who is everywhere unattached,* who has no love(or desire) even for body, life, etc., *not delighted at meeting with good nor vexed at evil,* who on being visited with pleasure or adversity as may befall him, neither rejoices at the former nor abhors the latter–*his,* of the person so devoid of joy or disappointment, *wisdom,* the Knowledge arising from discrimination, *becomes fixed.*

Moreover,

यदा संहरते चायं कूर्मोऽङ्गानीव सर्वशः ।
इन्द्रियाणीन्द्रियार्थेभ्यस्तस्य प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठिता ॥ ५८ ॥

Yadā saṁharate cāyam kūrmo (a) ngānīva sarvaśah
Indriyāṇīndriyārthebhyas-tasya prajñā pratiṣṭhitā

58. When also, like the tortoise its limbs from all sides, he firmly withdraws the senses from their objects, then his wisdom becomes established.

When also, like the tortoise its limbs from all sides, in the manner a tortoise withdraws its limbs every side out of fear, *he,* the ascetic ("yati") who has entered on the path of Knowledge, *firmly withdraws the senses from their objects,* i.e. from all objects in their entirety, *then his wisdom becomes established.*

Now, even the senses of a person, sick in body or mind, and unable to seize upon sensuous objects, draw back (from sense-objects) like the limbs of the tortoise, but not the taste (relish or longing) for them. How that taste is to be ended is being stated—

विषया विनिवर्तन्ते निराहारस्य देहिनः ।
रसवर्जं रसोऽप्यस्य परं दृष्ट्वा निवर्तते ॥ ५९ ॥

Viṣayā vinivartante nirāhārsya dehinaḥ
Rasa-varjam raso (a) pyasya param dṛṣṭvā nivartate

59. Objects fall away from the abstinent man, but not the longing (for them). Even that longing of his ceases on seeing the Supreme.

Although *objects* - 'viṣayāḥ' stands for the senses which are denoted by the sense-objects or for the objects themselves (such as sound)-*fall away from the abstinent man,* even in the case of the ignorant man undergoing a difficult penance and abstaining from sensuous objects, *the longing* for sensuous objects is left behind. The word 'rasa' is used in the sense of 'rāga' (longing) in such a sentence as "sva rasena pravṛttaḥ rasikaḥ rasajñaḥ" (The connoisseur full of innate longing is the discerner of the essential). *Even that longing of his ceases on seeing the Supreme.* In the case of the ascetic ("yati"), the subtle longing vanishes, when he sees the Supreme Reality, Brahman, and remains in the consciousness,

"I am myself That" ; then his understanding of sensuous objects becomes seedless (nir-bīja, i.e. incapable of producing any result). The import is that when Right Knowledge is not present, there can be no extirpation of the longing for sensuous objects, and therefore, effort should be made to stabilise the intellect in Right Knowledge.

And he who wishes to stabilise his intellect in right knowledge should first bring the senses under his control ; for, the Lord says that harm will arise if they are not so established (kept under control) :–

यततो ह्यपि कौन्तेय पुरुषस्य विपश्चितः ।
इन्द्रियाणि प्रमाथीनि हरन्ति प्रसभं मनः ॥ ६० ॥

Yatato hyapi Kaunteya puruṣasya vipaścitaḥ
Indriyāṇi pramāthīni haranti prasabham manaḥ

60. The turbulent senses, O son of Kunti, do violently snatch away the mind of even a striving wise man.

Of even a striving [71] *wise man, O son of Kunti, the turbulent senses*—they are capable of agitating the man who turns towards sensuous objects, and distracting him ; and, distracting him they *do snatch away violently,* forcibly and openly, when he is wide awake, his *mind,* though possessed of the understanding to discriminate.

Therefore,

तानि सर्वाणि संयम्य युक्त आसीत मत्परः ।
वशे हि यस्येन्द्रियाणि तस्य प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठिता ॥ ६१ ॥

Tāni sarvāṇi saṁyamya yukta āsīta matparaḥ
Vaśe hi yasyendriyāṇi tasya prajñā pratiṣṭhitā

71. 'Striving' consists in repeatedly perceiving the evil nature of sense-objects.(Ā)

61. Having controlled them all, (the ascetic) should remain steadfast, exclusively devoted to Me. Verily, his wisdom is established, whose senses are under control.

Having controlled, brought under submission, *them all, (the ascetic) should remain steadfast,* concentrated, *exclusively devoted to Me,* Vasudeva, the Innermost Self of all ; that is, he should remain fixed in the idea, 'I am none else than He' *Verily, his*–of the ascetic ("yati") who remains thus–*wisdom is established, whose senses are under control,* have been brought under control by the strength of practice.

And now, as for him who disregards (what has been stated above),–this, which is the source of all calamity, overtakes him :–

ध्यायतो विषयान्पुंस सङ्गस्तेषूपजायते ।
सङ्गात्संजायते कामः कामात्क्रोधोऽभिजायते ॥ ६२ ॥

Dhyāyato viṣyān-pumsah sangas-teṣūpajāyate
Sangāt-saṁjāyate kāmah kāmāt-krodho (a) bhijāyate

62. To the man thinking about the objects (of the senses) arises attachment towards them ; from attachment, arises longing ; and from longing arises anger.

To the man thinking about objects, reflecting on the particularities[72] of sense-objects, such as sound, *arises attachment towards them ; from attachment arises longing ; and from longing,* when it is somehow frustrated, *arises anger.*

क्रोधाद्भवति संमोहः संमोहात्स्मृतिविभ्रमः ।
स्मृतिभ्रंशाद्बुद्धिनाशो बुद्धिनाशात्प्रणश्यति ॥ ६३ ॥

72. Varieties of pleasantness or charm, (wrongly) attributed to them. (Ā)

Krodhā-d-bhavati sammohaḥ sammohāt-smṛti-vibhramaḥ
Smṛti-bhraṁśād-buddhināśo buddhināśāt-praṇaśyati

63. From anger comes delusion ; and from delusion, loss of memory ; form loss of memory, the ruin of discrimination ; and on the ruin of discrimination, he perishes.

From anger comes delusion, the absence of discrimination regarding what should be done and what should be avoided. Indeed, an angry person when deluded insults even his Guru /(Teacher or elder). And, *from delusion* will occur *loss of memory.* Even when conditions conducive to recollection (of what has been experienced) exist, the recollection of what was impressed by the influence of the teaching of Scripture and the Teacher will not arise. *From loss of memory, the ruin of discrimination* (buddhi)–the incapacity of the inner-sense (antaḥ-karaṇa) to distinguish between what should be done and ought not to be done; *and on the ruin of discrimination, he perishes* : he is a man, only so long as his inner faculty is capable of distinguishing between what should be done and what should be avoided ; when it is no longer able to do so, he is a lost man, as good as dead. Therefore, by the loss of buddhi (–antaḥ-karaṇa), he perishes, i.e. becomes incompetent to secure the objects of human endeavour (puruṣārthas).

Longing for sense-objects has been declared to be the root-cause of all calamity. Now, what leads to release (mokṣa) is being stated :–

रागद्वेषवियुक्तैस्तु विषयानिन्द्रियैश्चरन् ।
आत्मवश्यैर्विधेयात्मा प्रसादमधिगच्छति ॥ ६४ ॥

Rāga-dveṣa-viyuktaistu viṣayān-indriyaiścaran
Ātmavaśyair-vidheyātmā prasādam-adhigacchati

64. But the self-controlled man, moving among objects, with (his) senses free from attachment and

aversion and brought under his own control, attains to tranquillity.

But the self-controlled man, he whose inner-sense (ātma = antaḥ-karaṇa) is submissive to his will, *moving among objects,* i.e. getting only those which cannot be given up[73] ; *with (his) senses,* such as that of hearing, *free from attachment and aversion*–the natural activity of the senses is led by attachment or aversion ; he who is desirous of final emancipation (mumukṣu) has his senses free from attachment and aversion ;– *and brought under his own control, attains to tranquillity,* composure, repose in his Self.

What happens when tranquillity is attained, is being stated :

प्रसादे सर्वदुःखानां हानिरस्योपजायते ।
प्रसन्नचेतसो ह्याशु बुद्धिः पर्यवतिष्ठते ॥ ६५ ॥

Prasāde sarva-duḥkhānām hānir-asyopajāyate
Prasanna-cetaso hyāśu buddhiḥ paryavatiṣṭhate

65. In tranquillity, there issues the destruction of all his sorrows ; because the intellect of him who is tranquil-minded, is soon established in firmness.

In tranquillity, there issues the destruction of all his–of the ascetic ("yati")–*sorrows,* such as those relating to the body and the mind; *because , the intellect of him who is tranquil-minded,* whose inner sense (antaḥ-karaṇa) is composed, *is soon established in firmness,* stands fixed on all sides like space (ākāśa), i.e. remains steady in the form of the Self alone.

The purport of the passage (verses 64 and 65) is : The man who is tranquil-minded and whose intellect is established in firmness has thus accomplished his object (the supreme end in life). Wherefore,

73. being necessary for sustaining the body, such as food and drink. (Ā)

the self-controlled man (*yuktaḥ*) should engage himself in such actions (alone) as are not prohibited by the *śāstras* (scriptures) and which cannot be given up, with his senses devoid of attachment and aversion.

This state of tranquillity is (now) extolled :

नास्ति बुद्धिरयुक्तस्य न चायुक्तस्य भावना ।
न चाभावयतः शान्तिरशान्तस्य कुतः सुखम् ॥ ६६ ॥

Nāsti buddhir-ayuktasya na cāyuktasya bhāvanā
Na cābhāvayataḥ śāntir-aśāntasya kutah--sukham

66. To the unsteady, there is no knowledge; to the unsteady, no meditation either ; and to the un-meditative, no peace ; to one without peace, how (can there be) happiness?

To the unsteady, whose mind (antaḥ-karaṇa) is not concentrated, *there is,* there can be, *no knowledge* concerning the true nature of the Self. *To the unsteady,* there is *no meditation either,*–the close application to Self-knowledge. *And,* in the same way, *to the un-meditative,* who does not closely apply himself to Self-knowledge, there is *no peace,* tranquillity. *To one without peace, how* (can there be) *happiness?* Indeed, (true) happiness consists in the abstention of the senses from the craving for enjoying sense-objects ; not in the longing for them, which is mere unhappiness. The meaning is that so long as there is longing, there cannot be even the scent (a trace) of happiness.

Why is there no knowledge for the unsteady?

This is the reply :–

इन्द्रियाणां हि चरतां यन्मनोऽनुविधीयते ।
तदस्य हरति प्रज्ञां वायुर्नावमिवाम्भसि ॥ ६७ ॥

Indriyāṇām hi caratām yanmano (a) nuvidhīyate
Tadasya harati prajñām vāyvur-nāvam-ivāmbhasi

67. The mind which follows the senses which are wandering–that (mind) carries away his understanding, as the wind a boat on water.

Because, *the mind which follows* in the wake of *the senses which are wandering,* i.e. moving forward towards their respective objects,–*that* mind, being engaged in separating and catching up the objects of the senses–*carries away his understanding,* destroys the understanding of the ascetic, produced by the discrimination of the Self from the non-Self. How? *As the wind a boat on water.* Just as the wind draws a boat on water away from the course intended by the navigators and propels it on a wrong course, even so the mind carries away the understanding directed towards the Self and makes it turn towards sense-objects.

Having explained variously the appropriateness of the subject-- taught in verses 60 and 61, the Lord here concludes by establishing it [74].

Since it has been established that evil ensues from the activity of the senses,

तस्माद्यस्य महाबाहो निगृहीतानि सर्वशः ।
इन्द्रियाणीन्द्रियार्थेभ्यस्तस्य प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठिता ॥ ६८ ॥

Tasmād-yasya mahābāho nigrhītani sarvaśaḥ
Indriyaṇīndriyārthebhyas-tasya prajñā pratiṣṭhitā

68. Therefore, O mighty-armed, he whose senses are completely restrained from sense-objects, his knowledge is steady.

74. The subject taught in verses 60 and 61 is explained by the reasoning in verses 62 *et seq* ; the teaching is established by verses 66 and 67. (Ā)

Therefore, O mighty-armed, he, the ascetic, *whose senses are completely restrained* i.e. mentally and in all other ways, *from sense-objects* such as sound, *his knowledge is steady.*

What constitutes secular (*laukika*) and religious (*vaidika*) activity is the product of nescience (*avidyā*) ; and so, for the person who has acquired discriminative knowledge and whose wisdom has become steady, it (activity) ceases on the cessation of nescience. The cessation occurs because nescience is opposed to knowledge (*vidyā*). Making this matter clear, the Lord says :

या निशा सर्वभूतानां तस्यां जागर्ति संयमी ।
यस्यां जाग्रति भूतानि सा निशा पश्यतो मुनेः ॥ ६९ ॥

Yā niśā sarva-bhūtānām tasyām jagarti saṁyamī
Yasyām jāgrati bhūtani sā niśā paśyato muneḥ

69. That which is night to all beings, in that (state) the self-controlled man wakes. That in which all beings are awake, that is night for (him,) the Muni who sees.

That which is night to all beings,–Night, being of the nature of darkness ("tamas") produces lack of perception concerning all objects. What is that (which is night to all beings)? The Supreme Reality, which is the sphere of the man of steady wisdom. Just as what is day for others becomes night for those who (are habituated to) prowl about in the night,–in the same way, for all beings who are ignorant and stand in the position of night-prowlers, the Supreme Reality is like night, It being outside the range of vision of those who do not devote their minds to it. *In that,* the (state of the Supreme Reality), *the self-controlled man,* the yogi who has subdued his senses, *wakes,* having arisen out of the sleep of nescience. *That,* the night of ignorance (avidyā) characterised by the dualistic notions of objects and senses (things grasped and the organs that grasp), *in which all beings,* those who are really asleep, *are* said to be *awake,* in the manner sleeping persons see dreams, *that is night,* being nescience (avidyā), *for* (*him*) *the Muni who sees* the Supreme Reality.

Therefore, actions are enjoined only (on persons) in the state of ignorance, not (on those) in the state of Knowledge. When Knowledge has arisen, ignorance gets destroyed, even as the darkness of the night on the rising of the sun. Before the dawn of Knowledge, nescience (i.e. duality) is accepted as a valid conception, and, being experienced in different forms as actions, means and results, becomes the origin of all activity. When, however, it is regarded as of no validity, it fails to be the source of activity. Verily, a person applies himself to action with the notion, "This work is enjoined on me by the Veda which is the authority, and therefore I should perform it", and not with the notion, "All this is mere illusion (*avidyā*), like night".[75] But the knower of the Self, who has the wisdom, "All this aggregate of duality is mere illusion" has his duty only in the renunciation of all actions, and not in their performance. The Lord accordingly shows in the verse, "Those who have their intellect absorbed in That, whose Self is That" (V-17), that such a man's duty lies in *jñāna-niṣṭhā*–steadfastness in wisdom.

Objection–Even there, in the absence of an impelling authority,[76] there is no possibility of application to it (*Jñāna-niṣṭha*) (by anybody)

Reply– The objection cannot hold, because Self-Knowledge concerns one's own Self. Indeed, there is no necessity for any injunction to direct one towards his Self (Ātman), It being nothing else than Him-Self. And, the validity of all the (Scripture) means of proof (*Pramāṇas*) has its end in it (Self-knowledge). Verily, when the true nature of the Self has been realised, there is no further scope for the play of means of knowledge (proof) and objects to be known (though them). Truly does the final testimony (Self-knowledge) dispel the notion of the Self being the perceiver (of objects) ; and, even while it does so dispel, itself ceases to be an authority,– in the same way as what was valid in the dream-state (ceases to be so) on waking. In worldly experience too, we do not find that any authority does prompt (further) action (to attain an object) when the object is already attained (or perceived).

Wherefore, it stands established that, for the knower of the Self, there is no duty to perform works.

75. i.e. like the dream in the night (sleep).

76. *pravartakam pramāṇam* – *vidhi* (Scriptural injunction). (Ā)

Expounding, through an example, that the attainment of liberation (*mokṣa*) is possible only for the ascetic who is wise, who has abandoned desires, and whose wisdom is steady, and not for the non-renouncer longing for objects of desire, the Lord proceeds :

आपूर्यमाणमचलप्रतिष्ठं
समुद्रमापः प्रविशन्ति यद्वत् ।
तद्वत्कामा यं प्रविशन्ति सर्वे
स शान्तिमाप्नोति न कामकामी ॥ ७० ॥

Āpūryamāṇam-acala-pratiṣṭham
Samudram-āpaḥ praviśanti yadvat
Tadvat-kāmā yam praviśanti sarve
Sa śāntim-āpnoti na kāmakāmī

70. As into the ocean–brimful and still–flow the waters, even so he into whom enter all desires attains peace ; not the man who hankers after objects.

As in to the ocean – brimful and still–being filled by waters and yet standing undisturbed–*flow the waters* coming from all the sides into the ocean, which remains within itself (its own bounds) and unchangeable–, *even so, he, into whom enter all desires, into whom* all sorts of desires enter from all sides without changing his nature, even though he be situated in the presence of objects of enjoyment,– even as the waters the ocean ; that is to say, the desires just disappear into the Self (Ātman), instead of getting him under their own sway– (he alone) *attains peace,* liberation (mokṣa) ; but *not* any other, *the man who hankers after objects* of enjoyment: he who is given to longing after pleasureable objects can never attain it.

Because it is so, therefore –

विहाय कामान्यः सर्वान्पुमांश्चरति निःस्पृहः ।
निर्ममो निरहङ्कारः स शान्तिमधिगच्छति ॥ ७१ ॥

Vihāya kamān-yaḥ sarvān-pumāṁścarati niḥspṛhaḥ
Nirmamo nirahaṁkāraḥ sa śāntim-adhigacchati

71. That man, who, abandoning all desires, moves about, devoid of longing, without the sense of 'mine' without egotism,–he attains peace.

That man, the man of renunciation (saṁnyāsin), *who, abandoning all desires*, completely and in their entirety, *moves about* acting barely for the sustenance of life, *devoid of longing* even in regard to the sustenance of life in the body, *without the sense of 'mine'*, without the attachment, 'these belong to (are for) me', even while accepting the bare necessities of life, *and without egotism*, without any self-esteem due to the possession of knowledge (or learning) and the like– *he*, such an one, steady in wisdom, the knower of Brahman, *attains peace*, characterised by the cessation of all the miseries of saṁsāra (metempsychosis) and termed as final liberation : he becomes one with Brahman.

This devotion to Knowledge is thus glorified :

एषा ब्राह्मीस्थितिः पार्थ नैनां प्राप्य विमुह्यति ।
स्थित्वाऽस्यामन्तकालेऽपि ब्रह्मनिर्वाणमृच्छति ॥ ७२ ॥

Eṣā Brāhmī-sthitiḥ Pārtha naināṁ prāpya vimuhyati
Sthitvā(a) syām-antakale(a) pi Brahma-nirvāṇam-ṛcchati

72. This is the Brāhmic state, Pārtha! None, attaining to this, becomes deluded. Being established herein even at the end of life, one attains to the Bliss of Brahman.

This which has been spoken of above, *is the Brāhmic state*, the state of being in Brahman, abidance as Brahman Itself renouncing all action, *O Pārtha! None, attaining to*, regaining, *this* state *becomes*

deluded, falls into delusion (any longer). *Being established herein,* the Brāhmic state referred to, *even at the end of life,* even in the last period of life[77]. , *one attains to the Bliss of Brahman, liberation* (mokṣa). Need it be said of him, who renounces direct from the stage of student life (Brahmacarya) and dwells in Brahman alone to the end of his life, that he attains to Brahma-nirvāṇa, the Bliss of Brahman?

इति श्री महाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्या
भीष्मपर्वणि श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु
ब्रह्मविद्यायां योगशास्त्रे श्रीकृष्णार्जुन-
संवादे सांख्ययोगोनाम
द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥

Iti Śri Mahābhārate śata-sāhasryām samhitāyām Vaiyāsikyām
Bhīṣma-Parvaṇi Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītāsūpaniṣatsu
Brahma-vidyāyām yoga-śāstre Śrī Kṛīṇārjuna-
samvāde Sāṁkhya-yogo nāma
dvitīyo (a) dhyā-yaḥ

Thus the second chapter entitled 'The Way of Knowledge' in the Upaniṣads known as 'The Celebrated Songs of the Lord' – expounding the knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between Sṛī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna embodied in the Bhīṣma Parva of Sri Mahābhārata, the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyāsa.

77. i.e. in the fourth part (period) of life. (Ā). The reference is to the adoption of the life of renunication (*sāmnyāsa-āśrama*) in the normal course (vide note 12, Introduction).

॥ तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥
(कर्मयोगः)

TṚTĪYO (A) DHYĀYAḤ
(KARMA YOGAḤ)

CHAPTER - III
(WAY OF ACTION)

The two kinds of wisdom, one relating to the path of Action (*pravṛtti*) and the other to the path of Renunciation (*nivṛtti*), with which the (*Gītā-*) *Śāstra* was intended to deal, have (respectively) been indicated by the Lord as wisdom in *Yoga* and as wisdom in *Sāṁkhya* (II-39). In the verses, commencing from, "When a man completely casts away all the desires" (II-55) to the end of the (foregoing) Chapter, He lays down that the duty of those who have betaken themselves to *Sāṁkhya*-wisdom is to renounce action and declares in the verse, "This is the Brāhmic state" (II-72) that by devotion to that (wisdom) alone, they attain fulfilment. And, as for Arjuna, He has declared in the verse, "Your right is to. work alone,......neither let your attachment be towards inaction" II-47), that his duty lay in the performance of works, betaking himself to the *Yoga*-wisdom ; but He has not stated that, thereby, supreme felicity (*śreyas – mokṣa*) would be attained[1].

Noticing this, Arjuna's mind became agitated and he gave expression (to the Lord) to his thought : Having made me– a devotee and a seaker after liberation–hear about the direct means to final beatitude, namely devotion to the *Sāṁkhya*-wisdom, why does He (the Lord) charge me to engage in work, which is patently full of many evils,[2] and which even as a step does not, with certainty,[3] lead to the attainment of the supreme felicity?" His

1. Because of the statement : "Work is verily far inferior, etc." (II-49). (Ā)
2. Vide chap. I. verses 36 to 45.
3. i.e. in this very life. (Ā)

agitation is thus justifiable. And his question, "If knowledge is considered superior to action, etc." (III-1). reflects his perplexity And the words spoken by the Lord to dispel (the doubt implicit in) the question elucidate the distinction already stated (between *Sāṁkhya* and *Yoga*)-(III-3).

A certain commentator[4] understands the meaning of Arjuna's question differently and represents the Lord's reply as opposed to it (the question). He has also determined (in a certain way) what the purport of the *Gītā*-teaching is in the introduction (in his commentary), but interprets the meaning of the question and the answer here in quite the opposite way. How? In his introduction, it is stated that the simultaneous practice of Knowledge and works is prescribed in the *Gītā-śāstra* for persons in all stages of life (*āśramas*), and in particular that the view that *mokṣa* is attained by Knowledge alone, abandoning the works enjoined by scripture for performance throughout life, is absolutely discountenanced. But here (in Chap. III), by speaking of different paths for different *āśramas,* he admits (as proper) the renunication of those very works (enjoined by Scripture for performance throughout life[5])' How, indeed, could the Lord have expressed to Arjuna such kind of contradictory teachings, and what sense, (or how) indeed could the hearer have made any out of (or accepted) such contradiction?

Here, it might be said[6]: Let it then be thus : *Mokṣa* solely by Knowledge, preceeded by renunication of works prescribed by the *Śruti,* is precluded for house-holders alone, and not for those in the other āśramas (orders of life).–This also involves a contradiction between the earlier and the subsequent statements. How? Having (first) asserted that the simultaneous practice of Knowledge and works is prescribed in the *Gītā-śāstra* for persons of all *āśramas,* how can the contrary be declared now, namely that *mokṣa* solely through Knowledge is for the other orders (than the householder's)?

It might be said : It is from a consideration of the necessity for (performance of) the works prescribed in the *Śruti* that the

4. The Vṛttikāra. (Ā)

5. i.e. by *Saṁnyāsins,* who betake themselves to the path of Knowledge (Ā)-vide III-3.

6. Explanations from the standpoint of the Vṛttikāra. (Ā)

declaration is made precluding *mokṣa* for *gṛhasthas* (house-holders) through mere Knowledge dissociated from works prescribed by Śruti. Here, action prescribed by Smṛti for *gṛhasthas* is disregarded, as if it did not exist[7] ; and it is (accordingly) denied that *mokṣa* cannot be attained (by them) through mere knowledge. This is also wrong ; for, how can men with intelligence accept that *moksa* through Knwledge associateed with *smārta-karma* (Karma prescribed by Smrtis) is precluded for the *gṛhasta* alone and not for the other *āśramas?* Further, if , in the case of *saṁnyāsins*[8], *smarta-karma* can be associated (with Knowledge) as the means to *mokṣa,* then, combination (of knowledge) with *smarta-karma* alone need be prescribed for the *gṛhasta* as well, and not with *śrauta-karma* (Karma prescribed by Śruti).

It might now be said : Then, let it be that combination (of Knowledge) with both *śrauta-karma* and *smārta-karma* is the prescribed means for *mokṣa* in the case of the *gṛhastha* only ; but, as for *saṃnyāsins mokṣa* is attainable through Knowledge associated with *smārta-karma* alone. If it be so. then a heavy load of *śrauta* and *smārta karmas* will have been laid on the *gṛhastha's* head, involving a variety of exertion, and very troublesome in nature.

Now it might be said : Let it then be that *mokṣa* is attainable only by the *gṛhastha*, by reason of his undergoing a variety of exertion, and not by (those in) the other orders(*āśramas*), they not having the (duty to perform) obligatory *śrauta-karma*. Even this is improper. For, in all the Upaniṣads, and in the Ithihāsas, Purāṇas and Yoga-śāstra, renunciation of all action is prescribed for the seeker after *mokṣa* as an auxiliary to Knowledge. Moreover, *Śruti* and *Smṛti* prescribe optional or gradual passage (to the order of *saṁnyāsa*)[9].

7. The works prescribed by *Sruti* are pre-eminently necessary. Without them, works prescribed by *Smṛti,* though present (along with Knowledge) are as good as non-existent. Hence the reference to Knowledge as 'mere Knowledge'. (Ā) Vide note 6 in Chapter II

8. *Ūrdhva-retas* : One who lives in perpetual celibacy, with his sex-power raised upwards.

9. "Completing *brahmacarya,* one should become a *gṛhastha,* leaving (thereafter) the house and having become a *vānaprastha,* he should then (finally) renounce ; or differently-from *brahmacarya* direct, or from the house, or from the forest". (*Jābāla Upaniṣad,*4). So, there is nothing to entitle the householder's life to special pre-eminence. (Ā)

Then is it not established that combination of Knowledge with works is necessary for persons of all *āśramas*?[10]-Not so, because renunciation of all action is enjoined on the seeker after *mokṣa* as will be seen from the following Śruti texts :-

"Having risen up against desires (i.e. having abandoned them), they go about leading a mendicant life" (Br. III-v-1) ;

"Therefore, do they say that renunciation is pre-eminent among these austerities." (*Nā*. II-79) ;

"Renunciation alone excelled" (*Nā*. II-78) ;

"Not by work, not by progeny, not by wealth, but by renunciation, a few attained immortality" (*Nā*. II-12) ;

"One may renounce from *Brahmacarya* "(student-life)" (*Jābāla Upaniṣad* -4).

Also from the following texts :-

"Give up virtue and give up vice ; give up both truth and untruth. Having given up both truth and untruth, give up that[11] by which you give them up" (*M.B.* - *Ś*- 329-40 ; 331-41.)

"Seeing *saṁsāra* (worldly life) to be worthless, and betaking themselves to supreme non-attachment, they renounce without marrying, intent on discerning the real truth." (Bṛhaspati to Kaca).

Śuka teaches : "Man gets bound by action ; and gets released through Knowledge. Therefore, far-seeing ascetics do not engage in action" (*M.B.* - *Ś*- 243-7).

Here also (in the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, V-13) - "Having renounced all actions by the mind." etc.

Also because *mokṣa* is not a result to be achieved by action, action is of no use for the seeker of *mokṣa*.

10. Since all the *āśramas* are sanctioned by *Śruti* and *Smṛti*. the respective duties (works) prescribed for each have to be associated with Knowledge. (Ā)

11. The feeling that 'I am giving up'. (Ā)

Objection–Obligatory rites must be performed in order to avoid (the) sin (of non-performance).

Reply– No ; because the sin (of non-performance) is incurred only by one who is not a *saṃnyāsin*[12]. For non-worship of Agni (the sacred fire) etc., It is surely not possible to ascribe sin to the *saṁnyāsin,* in the way non-*saṁnyāsins* and *karmins,* such as *Brahmacārins* and *gṛhasthas,* would incur it. And, indeed, it is inconceivable that sin, a reality (*bhāva-rūpa*) can arise from mere non-performance (*abhāva*) of obligatory duties' ; for the *Śruti,* "How can existence arise out of non-existence?" (Ch. VI-ii-2) teaches the impossibility of an existent being produced out of a non-existent.

If (it be urged that) the Veda can declare even that which is nconceivable,[13] namely the incurring of sin through non-performance of obligatory duty, then it would signify that the Veda is productive of harm and hence of no authority, in as much as the performance and the non-performance of obligatoty duties would both result in unhappiness. And further, the unreasonable thesis would have been set up that the Śāstra is *creative* (*kāraka*) and not *indicative* (*jñāpaka*)[14]–which is acceptable to none.

Therefore, (it is conculded that) works (*karmas*) are not (enjoined) for *saṁnyāsins ;* and hence the incompatibility of the simultaneous combination of Knowledge and action.

Also, because Arjuna's question, "If it be considered by Thee that Knowledge is superior to action, etc." (III-1) will become inapt ; for, if the Lord had taught him in the second chapter that he should practise Knowledge and also engage in works simultaneously, that question of Arjuna would be improper. And, if he had been taught that he should take both to Knowledge and to works, then Knowledge which 'is superior to action' would also be prescribed

12. For, there cannot be the sin of non-performance (of prescribed duties) for the *saṁnyāsin* who has to give up all work. (Ā)

13. as being contradicted by another *Śruti* (Ch. VI-ii-2), referred to. (Ā)

14. It is acknowledged by all that the *Śāstra* proceeds on the basis of the potentialities of *padārthas* (categories) as universally known, and does not impart any new power to them, and is therefore only *Jñāpaka*. (A)

for him ; and the enquiry 'why, then, dost thou engage me in this terrible action?' (III-1) is on no account justified. There is also no reason to suppose that, in His previous teaching, the Lord had told Arjuna that he alone should not engage in the 'superior' Knowledge, in which case the question may be justified. But, if he had been previously taught by the Lord that Knowledge and action are intended for practice by different (classes of) persons-since devotion to (both of) them at the same time by one (and the same) person is impossible–they being mutally opposed–then, this question (III-1) becomes appropriate.

Even supposing that Arjuna's question was due to ignorance,[15] the Lord's reply pointing to (two paths for) practice by different (classes of) persons is not suitable[16]. But, since it is unimaginable that the Lord's reply was due to (His) ignorance, and since His reply shows that Knowledge and action are intended for 'practice by different (classes of) persons, the impossibility of the simultaneous combination of Knowledge and action is established.

Thus the settled import of the *Gītās* and all the Upaniṣads is this : that *mokṣa* is obtainable purely by Knowledge alone.

Further, the request (to be instructed) about only one of the two, Knowledge and action, "Tell me decidedly that one" (III-2) cannot be justified if the simultaneous practice of both were possible. And, by emphatically saying, "Do you therefore perform action only" (IV-15), the Lord shows the impossibility of devotion to Knowledge, in the case of Arjuna.

अर्जुन उवाच—

ज्यायसी चेत्कर्मणस्ते मताबुद्धिर्जनार्दन ।
तत्किं कर्मणि घोरे मां नियोजयसि केशव ॥ १ ॥

15. failure to understand the teaching in the manner interpreted by the Vṛttikāra.

16. as it is similar in form to the question, it is unacceptable from the Vṛttikāra's standpoint.

Arjuna uvāca–
Jyāyaśi cet-karmaṇaste matā-buddhir-Janārdana
Tat-kim karmaṇi ghore mām niyojayasi Keśava

Arjuna Said –

1. If it be considered by Thee, O Janārdana, that Knowledge is superior to action, why then dost Thou, O Keśava, engage me in this terrible action ?

If it be considered by Thee, if it is Thy opinion, *O Janārdana, that knowledge is superior* as compared *to action, why then,* for what reason, *O Keśava! dost Thou engage me in this terrible,* cruel *action,* characterised by killing?

If simultaneous combination of Knowledge and action had been favoured (by the Lord), then the means to supreme felicity (*śreyas–mokṣa*) would be one (only) ; and the separation of Knowledge from action, made by Arjuna, by referring to Knowledge as superior to action, would be wrong ; for, indeed, it (Knowledge) cannot be productive of a distinct (superior) result as compared to that (action). Also, Arjuna's question, "Why then, etc.", prompted by the thought–"Knowledge has been declared by the Lord to be superior to action[17], but He has asked me to perform action,[18] which is productive of unhappiness (not productive *śreyas*). I am unable to understand the reason for this",–and spoken as if he was taunting the Lord, would be unaccountable. Likewise, if the combination (of Knowledge) with *smārtakarma* alone had been intended by the Lord for all persons and had been so understood by Arjuna also, how can his words, "Why, then, dost Thou engage me in this terrible action?" be justified?

Moreover–

व्यामिश्रेणेव वाक्येन बुद्धिं मोहयसीव मे ।
तदेकं वद निश्चित्य येन श्रेयोऽहमाप्नुयाम् ॥ २ ॥

17. II-49. (A)
18. II-47. (A)

Vyāmiśreṇeva vākyena buddhim mohayasīva me
Tad-ekam vada niścitya yena śreyo (a) ham-āpnuyām

2. With (these) seemingly confusing words, Thou art, as it were, bewildering my understanding. Tell me decidedly that one by which I can attain to the highest.

With (these) seemingly confusing words–Undoubtetedly, the Lord is of faultless speech ; yet to me, of dull understanding, His teaching appears to be confusing. Thereby, *Thou art, as it were, bewildering my understanding.* (Arjuna means :) Thou art indeed engaged in dispelling my mental delusion ; how couldst Thou at all bewilder me? Therefore, I say that Thou art *as it were* bewildering my understanding. (He continues :) If Thou thinkest that, being intended for different (classes of) persons, Knowledge and action are impossible of being practised by one (and the same) person, then, in that case, *tell me decidedly that one,* Knowledge or action, that which you determine as appropriate for (me), Arjuna, in accordance with his (my) intelligence, capacity and condition,[19] *by which,* Knowledge or action, *I can attain to the highest.*

If Knowledge had been spoken of by the Lord as at least a secondary (accessory) to devotion to works (*Karma-niṣṭhā*) why should Arjuna desire to hear about only one of them? Surely, the Lord had not told him that he would teach him about only one of the two, Knowledge or action, but not about both–when alone he could have asked for one only, thinking that it would not be possible for him to obtain (instruction concerning) both.

Quite in accord with the question (of Arjuna), the reply (of the Lord) follows :

श्री भगवानुवाच —
लोकेऽस्मिन्द्विविधा निष्ठा पुरा प्रोक्ता मयाऽनघ ।
ज्ञान योगेन सांख्यानां कर्मयोगेन योगिनाम् ॥ ३ ॥

19. For Arjuna, a *kṣatriya,* in accordance with his intelligence (*buddhi*), capacity of his physical constitution, and condition at the commencement of battle. (A)

Śrī Bhagavān uvāca -
Loke (a) smin-dvividhā niṣṭhā purā proktā mayā (a) nagha
Jñāna-yogena sāṁkhyānām karma-yogena yoginām

The Blessed Lord said -

3. In this world, O sinless one! the two-fold path of devotion (steadfast practice) was taught by Me, in the beginning : by *Jñāna-Yoga* for the Sāṁkhyas, (and) by Karma-Yoga for the Yogins.

In this world for persons belonging to the three castes authorised to undertake Scriptural practices, *O sinless one, the two-fold path of devotion,* discipline, intended for steady practice, *was taught by Me,* the Omniscient Lord (Iśvara), *in the beginning* of Creation, after having created people and revealed the tradition of the Vedic Teaching as the means for them to attain worldy prosperity and supreme felicity. What is that two-fold path? That is being stated : (One is) by *JñānaYoga,* the path of (devotion to) Knowledge, Knowledge itself being yoga[20] (the discipline), which was taught *for the Sāṁkhyas* those possessed of the discrimination to distinguish between the Self and the non-Self, who renounced the world even from Brahmacarya, who perfectly understood the Truth (in everything) in accordance with the Vedantic wisdom, who belonged to the highest order of ascetics known as Paramahamsas, and who always abided in Brahman alone. (The other is) *by Karma-Yoga,* the path of (devotion to) action, action itself being yoga[21] (the discipline), which was taught *for the Yogins,* i.e. Karmins, those inclined to action.

If the Lord were in favour of the view that Knowledge and action should be practised conjointly by one (and the same) person,

20. Knowledge of the Absolute Reality (*praramātma-vastu*), which itself is termed '*yoga*' that by which one gets united in Brahman. (Ā)

21. 'Dharma', which itself is 'yoga', that which bestows prosperity (*abhyudaya*). (Ā)

for one (and the same) object of human life, and if this view had already been declared or was going to be declared subsequently in the *Gītās*, and if such had been taught in the Vedas as well, how could He now teach Arjuna, who had become His pupil and was dear to Him, that devotion to Knowledge and devotion to action are intended for practice by distinctly separate (classes of) aspirants? If, again, it be supposed that the Lord thought: 'Arjuna, having heard about both Knowledge and action, will of himself take to both (devotions, simultaneously combined), but it is for others that I am now laying down (different paths) for devotion by distinct classes of aspirants', then it would amount to attributing to the Lord the passions of attachment and aversion and, therefore, untrustworthiness, which is impious. Wherefore, by no reasoning whatever can simultaneous conjunction of Knowledge with action (be deemed to have been prescribed).

As for Arjuna's reference to the 'superiority of Knowledge to action' (III-1), it stands established, because it has not been repudiated. And this path of devotion to Knowledge is for adoption by *saṁnyāsins* only; that this view has the Lord's approval is understood from His statement about (two different paths for) practice by distinct (classes of) persons.

Seeing that Arjuna was dejected at heart feeling, "Thou directest me, on the other hand[22], to perform only action, which is productive of bondage", and that he was thinking of not engaging in action, the Lord tells him–"By non-performance of works, etc........" (III-4).

Or[23]–Devotion to Knowledge and devotion to action being mutually opposed, they cannot be practised together by one (and the same) person; and consequently it may be doubted that either of them, quite independently of the other, can be the means to liberation (*puruṣārtha*). In order to convey the truth that devotion to action is a means to that goa.l, not independently, but by leading to the attainment of devotion to Knowledge, whereas devotion to Know-

22. The significance of *'ca'* (on the other hand) is: 'even though the superiority of Knowledge is known, yet'. (Ā)

23. Another argument for establishing the connection between what has been previously stated and what follows.

ledge, having been gained through devotion to action, leads to that goal, by itself, without the need for anything else, the Blessed Lord says :

न कर्मणामनारम्भान्नैष्कर्म्यं पुरुषोऽश्नुते ।
न च संन्यसनादेव सिद्धिं समधिगच्छति ॥ ४ ॥

Na karmaṇām-anārambhān-naiṣkarmyam puruṣo (a) śnute
Na ca saṁnyasanādeva siddhim samadhigacchati

4. By non-performance of works, man does not reach actionlessness ; neither by mere renunciation, does he attain to perfection.

By non-performance of works : Acts of devotion (*yajña*), performed in this birth or in a previous birth, cause purification of mind through destruction of sins committed in the past, and thereby bring about the advent of Knowledge and lead to devotion to the path of Knowledge, as has been stated in the Smṛti: "Knowledge dawns in man on the destruction of sinful acts (karma), when he sees the Self in (him-)self, as on the clear surface of a mirror" (*M.B.-Ś'* - 204-8). By desisting from such acts of devotion, *man does not reach actionlessless* (naiṣkarmya), exemption from activity and its results, i.e., steadiness in the path of devotion to Knowledge, namely, abidance as the actionless Self.

From the statement that one does not reach actionlessness by not performing works, it is to be understood that, on the other hand, by performing works one reaches actionlessness. Now, for what reason is actionlessness not reached by non-performance of action? The answer is that the performance of actions is the means to actionlessness. There is surely no atttainment of an end except through the proper means. And, karmayoga (devotion to action) is taught in the Śruti and also here (in the Gītās) as the means to Jñāna-Yoga (devotion to Knowledge), which is

characterised by actionlessness. In the Śruti which sets out the means for realising the (realm of the) Self, spoken of as the object to be realised, "The Brāhmanas seek to know this (Self) by the recitation of the Vedas, by yajña (worship), etc." (*Br.* IV-iv-22), karma-yoga is declared as a means to jñana-yoga. Here also, the Lord is going to declare the same in such passages as :

"Renunication (of action), O mighty-armed, is hard to attain without performance of action" (V-6) ;

"Devotees in the path of work perform action, forsaking attachment, for the purification of the self (-mind)" (V-11) ;

"Yajña, gift and also austerity are purifying to the wise" (XVIII-5).

Here a doubt arises–from the Smṛti passage, "Having granted protection from fear to all creatures, one should take to actionlessness" (*M.B.- Aśv* -46-18), it is evident that actionlessness can be attained even by renunciation of the prescribed duties ; from worldly experience also, it is very well-known that actionlessness is attained by non-performance of actions ;what then is the need for a seeker after actionlessness to take to action? To this, the Lord replies–

Neither by mere renunciation, by simply abandoning action, without possessing Knowledge, *does he attain to perfection,* abidance in devotion to Knowledge, characterised by actionlessness.

For what reason, then, can a person not attain to perfection, of the nature of actionlessness, through mere renunciation of action, destitute of Knowledge? On this enquiry for the reason, the Lord says–

न हि कश्चित्क्षणमपि जातु तिष्ठत्यकर्मकृत् ।
कार्यते ह्यवशःकर्म सर्वः प्रकृतिजैर्गुणैः ॥ ५ ॥

Na hi kaścit-kṣaṇamapi jātu tiṣṭhatyakarmakṛt
Kāryate hyavaśah-karma sarvah prakṛtijair-guṇaih

5. Verily, none can ever rest, for even an instant, without performing action ; for, everyone is made to act, helplessly, by the *Guṇas* born of *Prakṛti.*

Because, *verily none can ever rest for even an instant* of time *without performing action.* Why? *For, every one* living being *is made to act, helpnessly* indeed, *by the Guñas,* Sattva, Rajas and Tamas[24], *born* out *of Prakṛti.* By 'everyone' is to be understood, 'every un-illumined person' (ajña) ; for, since the Lord says, "He who is moved not by the Gunas" (XIV-23), thereby distinguishing the Sāṁkhyas (from the un-illumined who are under the sway of the Guṇas), Karma-yoga (devotion to action) is decidedly meant only for the un-illumined and not for the wise. As regards the wise, who are unmovable by the Guṇas and are by themselves devoid of movement (action), karma-yoga is out of place. And this has been explained at length in the commentary on (the verse) "The man who knows This to be indestructible, etc." (II-21).

As for the person who knows not the Self, it is certainly wrong for him to refrain from performing the prescribed works ; so, the Lord says :

कर्मेन्द्रियाणि संयम्य य आस्ते मनसा स्मरन् ।
इन्द्रियार्थान्विमूढात्मा मिथ्याचारः स उच्यते ॥ ६ ॥

Karmendriyāṇi saṁyamya ya āste manasā smaran
Indriyārthān vimūḍhātma mithyācārah sa ucyate

6. He, who, restraining the organs of action, sits calling to mind the objects of the senses, that stupid person is called a hypocrite.

He, who, restraining, drawing back, *the organs of action,* the hand and the rest, *sits calling to mind,* pondering over, *the objects*

24. For a description of the Guṇas, see chap. XIV-5 et seq.

of the senses, that stupid person, whose internal organ (antaḥ-karaṇa) has been deluded, *is called a hypocrtie,* a man of false conduct, one leading a sinful life.

यस्त्विन्द्रियाणि मनसा नियम्यारभतेऽर्जुन ।
कर्मेन्द्रियैः कर्मयोगमसक्तः स विशिष्यते ॥ ७ ॥

Yastvindriyāṇi manasā niyamyārabhate (A) rjuna
Karmendriyaiḥ karmayogam-asaktaḥ sa viśiṣyate

7. But (he) who, controlling the senses by the mind, engages, O Arjuna, with (his) organs of action, in karma-yoga, unattached, he excels.

But, on the contrary, (he) *who,* the un-illumined man (ajñaḥ) whose duty is to perform actions, *controlling the senses,* i.e. the organs of knowledge, *by the mind, engages, O Arjuna, with (his) organs of action.* speech, hand etc.,–In what? That is being told : *in Karma-Yoga,* the path of action, remaining *unattached* (to the result), *he excels* over the other, the hypocrite.

Wherefore,

नियतं कुरु कर्म त्वं कर्म ज्यायो ह्यकर्मणः ।
शरीरयात्राऽपि च ते न प्रसिद्ध्येदकर्मणः ॥ ८ ॥

Niyatam kuru karma tvam karma jyāyo hyakarmaṇaḥ
Śarīra-yātra (a) pi ca te na prasiddhyed-akarmaṇaḥ

8. Do you perform obligatory action ; for action is superior to inaction ; indeed, even the bare maintenance of your body would not be possible by inaction.

Do you perform obligatory action : That action which a person has the duty perform, which is prescribed by Śruti, not for obtaining

a (specific) fruit, is the obligatory action (for the person concerned). Do you perform it, O Arjuna! Why? *For, action is superior to,* productive of much more result than, *inaction,* the non-performance of action. How? Because, *indeed even the bare maintenance of your body,* supporting the body (by eating etc.), *would not be possible,* cannot be accomplished, *by inaction,* by remaining idle. Thus, the distinction between action and inaction is observable in practical experience.

What you think : "because action leads to bondage, it should not be performed"–that also is wrong. Why?

यज्ञार्थात्कर्मणोऽन्यत्र लोकोऽयं कर्मबन्धनः ।
तदर्थं कर्म कौन्तेय मुक्तसङ्गः समाचर ॥ ९ ॥

Yajñārthāt-karmaṇo (a) nyatra loko (a) yam karma-bandhanaḥ
Tad artham karma Kaunteya muktas saṁgaḥ samācara

9. Except for action performed for the sake of Yajña, this world is bound by action ; do you, O son of Kuntī, practise action for That, devoid of attachment.

In accordance with the Śruti, "Yajña, forsooth, is Viṣṇu (*Tait. Sam.* I-vii-4), Yajña (here) means Īśvara, the Supreme Lord. *This world,* i.e. mankind which is enjoined to engage in action and accordingly perfoms it, *is bound by action ;* action is a fetter for it, *except for* (the) *action performed for the sake of Yajña,* (i.e.) for the sake of Īśvara[25] : It does not get bound by action performed for the Lord. Therefore, *do you, O son of Kuntī, practise,* engage in, *action for That,* Yajña (The Lord), *devoid of attachment,* abandoning the desire for the fruit of action.

25. This is to dispel the idea that 'work is to be done for work's sake' (Ā), taking '*yajña*' to refer to the sacrificial rite.

For the following reason as well, action should be performed by him who is charged with its performance :

सह यज्ञाः प्रजाः सृष्ट्वा पुरोवाच प्रजापतिः ।
अनेन प्रसविष्यध्वमेष वोऽस्त्विष्टकामधुक् ॥ १० ॥

Saha yajñāḥ prajāḥ sṛṣṭvā purovāca Prajāpatih
Anena prasaviṣyadhv am-eṣa vo (a) stviṣṭa-kāmadhuk

10. Having in the beginning created mankind together with yajña, Prajāpati said, 'By this shall ye produce ; this shall be the milch-cow of your desires.

Having in the beginning of creation *created,* produced *mankind* the three castes (varṇas), *together with yajña,*[26] *Prajāpati,* the Creator of mankind, *said, "By this yajña, shall ye produce,* multiply, bring about birth ; *this* yajña *shall be the milch-cow of your desires,* that which yields all varieties of desires, fruits wished for.

How (can yajña yield the various desires wished for)?

देवान्भावयतानेन ते देवा भावतन्तु वः ।
परस्परं भावयन्तः श्रेयः परमवाप्स्यथ ॥ ११ ॥

Devān-bhāvayatānena te devā bhavayantu vaḥ
Parasparaṁ bhāvayantaḥ śreyah param-avāpsyatha

11. "Cherish the Devas with this ; and may those Devas cherish you : thus, cherishing one another, ye shall gain the highest good."

Cherish, exalt, *the Devas,* Indra and others gods, *with this* yajña ; *and may those Devas cherish you,* satisfy you through rain etc. ; *thus, cherishing one another,* mutualty, *ye shall gain the*

26. '*yajña*', here and in the sequel, means 'sacrifice', 'religious rite'.

highest good, mokṣa, in due course through the attainment of Knowledge, or heaven (svarga)[27].

And also -

इष्ठान्भोगन्हि वो देवा दास्यन्ते यज्ञभाविताः ।
तैर्दत्तानप्रदायैभ्यौ यो भुङ्क्ते स्तेन एव सः ॥ १२ ॥

Iṣṭān-bhogān-hi vo devā dāsyante yajña-bhāvitah
Taird-dattān-apradāyaibhyo yo bhuṅkte stena eva saḥ

12. "The Devas, cherished by yajña, will give you desired-for enjoyments. So, whoever enjoys their gifts, without offering (in return) to them, he is verily a thief.

The Devas, cherished by, exalted, pleased with, *yajna,* (your) sacrifices, *will give you desired-for enjoyments,* women, cattle progeny, etc. *So, whoever enjoys their gifts,* the enjoyments, *without offering (in return) to them,* merely gratifies his own body and sensee without acquitting the debt due to the gods, *he,* taking away the property of the gods and others[28], *is verily a thief.*

On the other hand,

यज्ञशिष्टाशिनः सन्तो मुच्यन्ते सर्वकिल्बिषैः ।
भुञ्जते ते त्वघं पापा ये पचन्त्यात्मकारणात् ॥ १३ ॥

Yajña-śiṣṭāśinaḥ santo mucyante sarva-kilbiṣaiḥ
Bhuñjate te tvagham pāpā ye pacantyatma-kāraṇāt

27. The alternative is due to the difference in the aspirant, according as he is one desiring salvation, or enjoyment. (Ā)

28. 'and others' refers to *ṛṣis* (Seers) and *pitṛs* (Manes) (Ā), to whom also n is born indebted.

13. The virtuous, eating the remnants of yajña, are freed from all sins ; but they who cook (only) for themselves, those wretches eat sin.

The virtuous, eating i.e. habituated to partaking of, *the remnants*, called 'ambrosia' (amṛta), of food left after the completion *of yajñas*, sacrifices to gods etc.[29], *are freed from all sins*–those occuring at the five places of slaughter[30], such as the fire-place, as also other sins arising from injury, etc., committed through inadvertence[31]; *but they*, the others, the selfish, *who cook* (*only*) *for themselves*, i.e. prepare food (to feed) their own persons, *those* being themselves *wretches, eat sin.*

For the following reason as well, action should be performed by him who has that duty. Action is indeed what causes the movement of the universe-cycle. How? The answer follows :

अन्नाद्भवन्ति भूतानि पर्जन्यादन्नसंभवः ।
यज्ञाद्भवति पर्जन्यो यज्ञः कर्मसमुद्भवः ॥ १४ ॥

Annādb-havanti bhūtāni parjanyād-anna-sambhavaḥ
Yajñād-bhavati parjanyo yajñaḥ karma-samud-bhavaḥ

14. From food come forth beings ; from rain food is produced ; from *yajña* arises rain ; *yajña* is born of *Karma*.

29, 30 and 31. The five places of slaughter in a household are at the fire-place, the wooden mortar in which corn or grain is threshed, the grindstone, the broom, and the water-pot. In these places, injury to life is knowingly caused. Injury is also caused to creatures, through inadvertence, such as by treading on them with the foot. Sin also arises by inadvertently coming into contact with impure objects. All sins are wiped away by the performance of the five *mahā yajñas* (great sacrifices)–to the gods, to the *pitṛs* (manes), to men, to Bhūtas (all created beings) and to the *ṛṣis* (*Brahma-yajña*). (Ā)

From food which has been eaten and been converted into blood and semen, directly *come forth* beings ; *from rain food is produced ; from* yajña arises rain, as taught in the Smṛti–

"The oblation duly made in the fire reaches the sun ; from the sun comes rain ; from rain food ; and from that all creatures". (M.S. III-76). *Yajña is born of Karma:* Yajña here refers to 'apurva'[32], and 'Karma' to the activities of the priest and the sacrificer, from which (activities) results the apūrva ; thus yajña (apūrva) is born of Karma.

And –

कर्म ब्रह्मोद्भवं विद्धि ब्रह्माक्षरसमुद्भवम् ।
तस्मात्सर्वगतं ब्रह्म नित्यं यज्ञे प्रतिष्ठितम् ॥ १५ ॥

Karma Brahmodbhavam viddhi Brahmākṣara samudbhavam
Tasmāt-sarva-gatam Brahma nityam yajñe pratiṣṭhitam

15. Know karma to have arisen from Brahma, and Brahma from the Imperishable. Therefore, the all-pervading Brahma is ever established in yajña.

Know Karma to have arisen from Brahman, the Veda, which is the creator of Karma ; *and Brahma,* that is, the Veda, to have arisen *from the Imperishable,* that is, from Brahman, the Supreme Self (Paramatman), as breath from man. *Therefore,* because it illumines all things, *Brahma* (Veda) is *all-pervading ;* and though all-pervading, it *is ever established in yajña,* because it chiefly deals with yajña (sacrifice) and the rules for its performance.

32. According to the Mīmāṁsā-Śāstra, *apurva* is the subtle form which sacrifice (or any action) assumes in the interval between its performance and the manifestation of its result. See also footnote 33, Chap. XVIII.

एवं प्रवर्तितं चक्रं नानुवर्तयतीह यः ।
अघायुरिन्द्रियारामो मोघं पार्थ स जीवति ॥ १६ ॥

Evam pravartitam cakram nānuvartayatīha yaḥ
Aghāyur-indriyārāmo mogham Pārtha sa jīvati

16. He, who here follows not the wheel thus set revolving, he of sinful life and satisfied in the senses, in vain, O son of Pṛthā, does he live.

He, who, being charged with the duty to perform action, *here,* in this world, *follows not the wheel* of the universe *thus set revolving* by Iśvara on the basis of the Veda and yajña (sacrifice), *he of sinful life,* i.e. he whose mode of living is sinful, *and satisfied in the senses,* and who delights in the pleasures of the senses, *in vain* uselessly, *O son of Prathā, does he live.*

The purport of this section is, therefore, that action must be performed by the un-illumined man, who has that duty. In the passage beginning from "By non-performance of works" (III-4) and ending with "Indeed, even the bare maintenance of the body..". (III-8), it was declared that before he becomes qualified for the practice of devotion to Self-Knowledge, devotion to works should be practised as the means thereto, by him who does not know the Self and has that duty (i.e. to perform works)' Also, incidentally, in the passage from "Except for action performed for the sake of Yajña" (III-9) to "In vain does he live" (III-16), many reasons[33] were set out as to why he who does not know the Self should perform action, and the censure[34] for failure to engage in action was also administered.

Apprehending that Arjuna might ask : "If such be the position, is the wheel thus set going to be followed by all? Or, only by him

33. Receiving the grace of the Lord and the kindness of Gods. (Ā)

34. becoming a 'thief' (to the gods). (Ā)

who has not yet attained to devotion in the path of Knowledge–which is practised by Sāṁkhyas who know the Self, and which is attainable through devotion to the path of Action already stated,– that is, by him who knows not the Self?", or of His own accord, for imparting a clear understanding of the import of the *Śāstra*,namely,

"Knowing this, the Self, and with false knowledge quitted, the wise Brāhmaṇas renounce the desires for progency etc., which are necessarily entertained by those who have (only) false knowledge, and take to mendicancy for bare sustenance of the body ; for, them there is nothingelse to do than devotion to Self-knowledge" (*Br.* III-v-I. followed).

And making it clear that this very truth taught in the *Śruti* is what He intends to explain in this *Gītā-Śāstra*, the Lord proceeds:

यस्त्वात्मरतिरेव स्यादात्म तृप्तश्च मानवः ।
आत्मन्येव च सन्तुष्टस्तस्य कार्यं न विद्यते ॥ १७ ॥

Yastvātmaratir-eva syād-ātma-tṛptaśca mānavaḥ
Ātmanyeva ca santuṣṭas-tasya kāryam na vidyate

17. But the man, who may be delighting only in the Self, and satisfied with the Self, and content in the Self alone,—for him, there is nothing to do.

But the man, a saṁnyāsin the Sāṁkhya devoted to Self-knowledge, *who may be delighting only in the Self,* and not in the objects of the senses, *and satisfied with the Self* alone, and not with food, drink, etc., *and content in the Self alone* : everybody, as is well-known, derives satisfaction by acquiring external things ; whereas he (the saṁnyasin) disregards such acquisition and is content in the Self alone, that is to say, he is completely bereft of desires; *for him,* for such a knower of the Self, *there is nothing to do,* to be done.

Besides,

नैव तस्य कृतेनार्थो नाकृतेनेह कश्चन ।
न चास्य सर्वभूतेषु कश्चिदर्थव्यपाश्रयः ॥ १८ ॥

Naiva tasya kṛtenārtho nākṛteneha kaścana
Na cāsya sarva-bhūteṣu kaścid-artha-vyapāśryah

18. For him, there is here no object by doing, and nothing by non-performance ; nor (is there) for him dependence on any being for any object.

For him, the man delighting in the Supreme Self, *there is here* in this world, *no object,* purpose to be gained, *by doing,* by action. But, is there not the evil called "pratyavāya" (sin) due to non-performance of action? *Nothing* at all of the nature of incurring sin or degradation of the self arises, (here) in this world, (for him) *by non-performance. Nor is there, for him, dependence on any being,* from Brahmạ down to immovable beings, *for any object.* Dependence is the seeking of patronage by means of activity, for securing a desired aim. For him, there is no object whatever to be gained by depending on any particular being, for which he need engage himself in action.

You (Arjuna) are not in this state of Perfect Knowledge-[35] which corresponds to the all-pervading flood (II-46).

Because of this –

तस्मादसक्तः सततं कार्यं कर्म समाचार ।
असक्तो ह्याचरन्कर्म परमाप्नोति पूरुषः ॥ १९ ॥

Tasmād-asktaḥ satatam kāryam karma samācara
Asakto hyācaran-karma param-āpnoti pūruṣaḥ

35. This is to rebut Arjuna's idea that he should cease from activity, be taking himself to (the path of) Knowledge. (Ā)

19. Therefore, without attachment, do you always perform that action which ought to be done ; for, performing action without attachment, man attains to the highest.

Therefore, without attachment, do you always perform that action which ought to be done, which is obligatory ; *for, performing action without attachment* for the sake of Īśvara (the Lord), *man attains to the highest,* mokṣa, through purification of the mind (sattva-śuddhi).

For the following reason also, :

कर्मणैव हि संसिद्धिमास्थिता जनकादयः ।
लोकसंग्रहमेवापि संपश्यन्कर्तुमर्हसि ॥ २० ॥

Karmaṇaiva hi samsiddhimsāsthitā Janakādayaḥ
Loka-saṁgraham-evāpi sampas'yan-kartum-arhasi

20. Verily, with (through) action alone did Janaka and others abide in (aim at) perfection. Also, with a view to the guidance of men, you should perform action.

Verily, with (through) action alone did,[36] in olden times, wise Kṣatriyas, *Janaka and others,* such as Aśvapati, *abide in (aim at) perfection,* remain in (apply themselves to attaining) liberation (saṁsiddhi mokṣa).

If they were persons who had attained Perfect Knowledge (of the Self), then the meaning is : they abided in the state of perfection, doing action as a result of prārabdha-karma, i.e., without renouncing action, for the guidance of the world[37]. If, on the other

36. See *Ch.* V-xi-4 et seq

37. Though Janaka and others engaged themselves in action as a result of their *prārabdha-karma* (the karma which led them to the current birth and had to be worked out in that birth), they abided in perfection through the majesty (*māhāttmya*) of their wisdom. (Ā)

hand, Janaka and others had not attained true Knowledge (of the Self), then the meaning is : they aimed at reaching perfection ultimately, through action which is the means to the purification of the mind.

If you think that obligatory works were performed even by Janaka and others of old, because they were not knowers of the Self, and that therefore they need not perforce be performed by another who has attained fulfilment (of life's purpose) by possession of true Knowledge, even then, in accordance with prārabdha-karma, and *also* simply *with a view to the guidance of men,* for the purpose of weaning them from proceeding on the wrong path, *you should perform action.*

Who is competent to guide the world and how? The answer follows :

यद्यदाचरति श्रेष्ठस्तत्तदेवेतरो जनः ।
स यत्प्रमाणं कुरुते लोकस्तदनुवर्तते ॥ २१ ॥

Yadyad-ācarati śreṣṭhas-tat-tad-evetaro janaḥ
Sa yat-pramāṇam kurute lokas-tad-anuvartate

21. Whatever the pre-eminent man does, that alone others do. Whatever he regards as authority, that people follow.

Whatever action *the pre-eminent man does, that* action *alone others,* his followers, *do,* Also, *whatever he,* the pre-eminent man *regards as authority,* secular or scriptural, *that people follow,* that alone they also regard as authority.

In case you (still) have any doubt as to this duty to guide the world, then cannot you observe Me?-

न मे पार्थास्ति कर्तव्यं त्रिषु लोकेषु किंचन ।
नानवाप्तमवाप्तव्यं वर्त एव च कर्मणि ॥ २२ ॥

Na me Pārthāsti kartavyam triṣu lokeṣu kiṁcana
Nānavāpta-avāptavyam varta eva ca karmaṇi

22. For Me, O son of Pṛthā, there is nothing whatever to do in the three worlds, nor anything unattained to be got ; yet I engage in action.

For Me, O Pārtha, there is nothing whatever to do in the three worlds even. Why? For *there is nothing unattained* (by Me) which has *to be got*, acquired (anew). *Yet,*[38] *I engage in action.*

यदि ह्यहं न वर्तेयं जातु कर्मण्यतन्द्रितः ।
मम वर्त्मानुवर्तन्ते मनुष्याः पार्थ सर्वशः ॥ २३ ॥

Yadi hyaham na varteya jātu karmaṇyatandritaḥ
Mama vartmānuvartante manuṣyāḥ Pārtha sarvaśaḥ

23. Were I not at all to engage in action with vigilance, O Pārtha, men would follow in my wake everywhere.

Were I not at all, at any time, *to engage in action with vigilance* without becoming indolent, *O Pārtha, men would follow in my wake,* in the course of conduct adopted by Me, the pre-eminent among them, *everywhere,* in every way, in all matters.

What harm is there in that? The Lord says :

उत्सीदेयुरिमे लोका न कुर्यां कर्म चेदहम् ।
संकरस्य च कर्ता स्यामुपहन्यामिमाः प्रजाः ॥ २४ ॥

Utisīdeyurime lokā na kuryām karma ced-aham
Saṁkarasya ca kartā syām-upahanyām-imāḥ prajāḥ

38. Though there is no object to be gained for Myself, (yet, i.e.) with a view to the guidance of the world. (Ā)

24. These worlds would be undone were I not to engage in action ; and I would be the cause of the admixture of castes and would ruin these beings.

These worlds, all of them, *would be undone,* would perish, for want of that activity which effects the sustenance of the universe, *were I not to engage in action ; and* moreover, *I would be the cause of the admixture of castes and would,* thereby, *ruin these beings* –I, whose purpose is to favour people, would be dooming them to destruction, which would be unworthy of Me, their Lord.

If, on the other hand, you or any other person should feel that, like Me, he has achieved fulfiment by being a knower of the Self,–even by him, action must be performed for the benefit of others, though there is nothing to be done for his own sake. This is stated –

सक्ताः कर्मण्यविद्वांसो यथा कुर्वन्ति भारत ।
कुर्याद्विद्वांस्तथाऽसक्ताश्चिकीर्षुर्लोकसंग्रहम् ॥ २५ ॥

Saktāḥ karmaṇy avidvāṁso yathā kurvanti Bhārata
Kuryād-vidvāṁs-tathā (a) saktāś-cikīrṣur- loka-saṁgraham

25. As do the unwise attached to work act, so should the wise act, O descendant of Bharata, without attachment, desirous of the welfare of the world.

As do the unwise, (who are) *attached to work act,* in the manner some (ignorant people) with the expectation, 'I am going to enjoy the fruit of this action' act, *O* descendant of *Bharata, so should the wise,* the knower of the Self, *act,* remaining *without attachment.* For what purpose he should so act, listen : *desirous of* bringing about *the welfare of the world*

For Me, or any other, who being a knower of the Self thus desires the welfare of the world, there is nothing to do, except for

guiding the world. Therefore, for such a knower of the Self, this (course of conduct) is prescribed.

न बुद्धिभेदं जनयेदज्ञानां कर्मसंगिनाम् ।
जोषयेत्सर्वकर्माणि विद्वान्युक्तः समाचरन् ॥ २६ ॥

Na buddhi-bhedam janayed-ajñānām karma-samginām
Joṣayetsarva-karmāñi vidvan-yuktaḥ samācaran

26. The wise man should not cause disturbance of the understanding of the un-enlightened, attached to action ; he should engage them in all actions, performing (them) diligently.

The wise man should not cause, bring about, the *disturbance,* unsteadiness, *of the understanding* which has taken the resolute form, "This act must be performed by me and I must enjoy its fruit", *of the* un-enlightened, those devoid of discrimination, *attached to action,* clinging to activity ; but, what should he do? *he should engage them in,* make them perform, *all actions,* himself *performing* them, the very same actions of the ignorant, *diligently,* proficiently.

How the ignorant man clings to activity is now being stated –

प्रकृतेः क्रियमाणानि गुणैः कर्माणि सर्वशः ।
अहंकारविमूढात्मा कर्ताहमिति मन्यते ॥ २७ ॥

Prakṛteḥ kriyamānāni guṇaiḥ karmāṇi sarvaśaḥ
Ahamkāra vimūḍhātmā kartāham-iti manyate

27. Actions are everywhere performed by the Guṇas of Prakṛti ; (but) the man whose mind is deluded by egoism thinks : 'I am the doer".

Actions, secular and scriptural, *are everywhere*, in all ways, *performed by the Guṇas*, the modifications in the forms of body and senses (kārya-karaṇa)[39] of *Prakrti* or Pradhāna, the state of equipoise of the (three) Guṇas, sattva, rajas and tamas ; (but) *the man whose mind is deluded by egoism*, whose inner-sense (antah-karaṇa) is multifariously deluded by egoism, the conception that the Self is the aggregate of kārya-karaṇa ; and consequently superimposing on himself the attributes of kārya-karaṇa (through nescience, avidyā) identifies himself with kārya-karaṇa ; and through avidyā believing that actions rest on him, *thinks* with regard to each and every action, *"I am the doer"*.

But as for the wise man,

तत्त्ववित्तु महाबाहो गुणकर्मविभागयोः ।
गुणा गुणेषु वर्तन्त इति मत्वा न सज्जते ॥ २८ ॥

Tattvavit-tu mahābāho guṇa-karma-vibhāgayoḥ
Guṇā guṇeṣu vartanta iti matvā na sajjate

28. But, O mighty-armed, he who knows the truth regarding the divisions of *Guṇa* and Karma, recognising that *Guṇas* (merely) act on *Guṇas*, does not become attached.

But, O mightly-armed, he who knows the truth–of what? – (of truth) *regarding the divisions of Guṇa and Karma*, i.e. of the divisions of Guṇas and of the divisions of Karma[40], *recognising that Gunas* as sense organs (*merely*) *act on Gunas* as objects of the senses, and that the Self (acts) not, *does not become attached*, forms no attachment.[41]

39. *Kārya* – effect ; *karaṇa* – instrument. The body is *kārya*. The five organs of action, the five organs of knowledge, manas, *buddhi* and *ahaṁkara* (*antaḥ-karaṇa*) are the *karaṇa* (XIII-20 Com.)

40. See IV-13 ; XIV-5 et seq. ; XVIII-19 et seq.

41. i.e. does not entertain the feeling that he is the agent with regard to any action. (Ā)

On the other hand,

प्रकृतेर्गुणसंमूढाः सज्जन्ते गुणकर्मसु ।
तानकृत्स्नविदो मन्दान्कृत्स्नविन्न विचालयेत ॥ २९ ॥

Prakṛter-guṇa-sammūḍhāḥ sajjante guṇa-karmasu
Tān-akṛtsanavido mandān-krtsnavin-na vicālayet

29. Those deluded by the Guṇas of Prakṛti attach (themselves) to the functions of the Guṇas. The man of Perfect Knowledge should not unsettle them of imperfect knowledge and of dull wit.

Those who are thoughtly *deluded by the Gunas of Prakrti, attach* themselves *to the functions of the Guṇas,* believing, "We engage in (this) action for the sake of (such and such) fruit."u *The man of Perfect Knowledge,* i.e. he who knows the Self, *should not* of himself *unsettle,* i.e. disturb the conviction (of understanding) of *them of imperfect knowledge* who are attached to work and look only to the fruit of the work, *and are of dull wit,* and are foolish.

How then should action be performed by the un-illumined man, who has the duty to perform works and who seeks liberation? The answer follows :

मयि सर्वाणि कर्माणि संन्यस्याध्यात्मचेतसा ।
निराशीर्निर्ममो भूत्वा युध्यस्व विगतज्वरः ॥ ३० ॥

Mayi sarvāṇi karmāṇi saṁnyas-yadhyātma-cetasā
Nirāśīr-niramamo bhūtvā yudhyasva vigata-jvaraḥ

30. Renouncing all actions in Me, with mind centred on the self, getting rid of hope and selfishness, fight–free from (mental) fever.

Renouncing, depositing, *all actions in Me*, Vāsudeva, the Supreme Lord, the Omniscient, the Self of all, *with mind centred on the self* with the clear understanding, "I am an agent, am acting for the Lord as His servant", and also, *getting rid of hope*, abandoning any expectation (of fruit), *and selfishness*, the idea of mine-ness[42], do you *fight-free from (mental) fever*, devoid of mental torment, grief[43].

This doctrine which has been taught with the authority therefor, namely that action should be engaged in, is exactly the truth[44] :

ये मे मतमिदं नित्यमनुतिष्ठन्ति मानवाः ।
श्रद्धावन्तोऽनसूयन्तो मुच्यन्ते तेऽपि कर्मभिः ॥ ३१ ॥

Ye me matam-idam nityam-anutiṣṭhanti mānavāḥ
Śraddhāvanto-(a) nasūyanto mucyante te (a) pi karmabhiḥ

31. Those men who constantly practise this teaching of Mine full of *śraddhā* and without cavilling, they too are freed from work.

Those men who constantly practise, follow, *this teaching of Mine, full of sraddha*[45], *faith, and without cavilling*, i.e. without finding fault it Me, Vāsudeva, the Guru (Teacher), *they too* who thus conduct themselves, *are freed from work* i.e. dharma and adharma[46].

42. with regard to sons, brothers etc., engaged in the battle. (Ā)

43. arising from the thought that by engaging in the battle you have to slay sons, brothers, etc. (Ā)

44. It leads one, who follows it, to liberation. (Ā). This answers the query preceding verse 30.

45. *Śraddhā* is faith in the teaching of Scripture, and of the Guru, concerning matters not (otherwise) manifest. (Ā)

46. Merit and demerit, virtue and sin ; the subtle forms in which good and evil actions stand till the time comes to enjoy their fruits. (See note 32 ante ; also Com. on verse 33 following).

ये त्वेतदभ्यसूयन्तो नानुतिष्ठन्ति मे मतम् ।
सर्वज्ञानविमूढांस्तान्विद्धि नष्टानचेतसः ॥ ३२ ॥

Ye tvetad-abhyasūyanto nānutiṣṭhanti me matam
Sarva-jñān-vimūḍhāṁstān-viddhi naṣṭān-acetasah

32. But those who, decrying this teaching of Mine, do not practise (it), deluded in all knowledge, and devoid of discrimination, know them to be ruined.

But those, as contra-distinguished (from the virtuous referred to, *who decrying,* finding fault with *this teaching of Mine, do not practise* (it), conform to it, such people are in many ways *deluded in*) mistaken about, *all* kinds of *knowlege, and devoid of discrimination ; know them to be ruined*, lost.

Now, from what reason do they not follow Thy (Sri Kṛṣṇa's) teaching, perform the duty of others, and neglect their own? Thus offending Thee, why do they not dread the sin of transgressing Thy command? The Lord says (by way of reply):

सदृशं चेष्टते स्वस्याः प्रकृतेर्ज्ञानवानपि ।
प्रकृतिं यान्ति भूतानि निग्रहः किं करिष्यति ॥ ३३ ॥

Sadṛśam ceṣṭate svasyāḥ prakṛter jñānavān-api
Prakṛitim yānti bhūtani nigrahaḥ kim kariṣyati

33. Even a wise man acts in conformity with his own nature. (All) beings follow nature ; what can restraint do?

Even a wise man acts in conformity with his own nature. Prakṛti (nature) is the saṁskāra, impression, of dharma and

adharma arising out of past actions, and manifested at the commencement of the present birth. In accordance with that, every being, even a wise man, acts. What then to say of the dull-witted! Thus, *all beings follow* (their own) *nature. What can restraint,* by Me or any other, *do*?

If every being acts only in accordance with his own nature—and there is none without a 'nature' (of his own),—then, there is no scope for human effort (*puruṣakāra*), and *Śāstra* (Scripture or Precept) would be futile. To meet this (objection), the Lord says:

इन्द्रियस्येन्द्रियस्यार्थे रागद्वेषौ व्यवस्थितौ ।
तयोर्न वशमागच्छेत्तौ ह्यस्य परिपन्थिनौ ॥ ३४ ॥

Indriyasyendriyasyārtha rāga-dveṣau vyavasthitau
Tayōr-na vaśamāgacchet-tau hyasya paripan-thinau

34. Attachment and aversion of each sense for its (respective) object are natural : let no man come under their sway ; for, they are his foes.

Attachment and aversion of each sense for its (respective) *object*, i.e. of all the senses for their respective objects, such as sound etc., with respect to the object of each sense, attachment for the desirable and aversion to the undesirable, *are natural,* inevitable.

The scope for human effort and for the Śāstra (Teaching) in this matter is now being explained: One who embarks on following the teaching of the Śāstra should, even at the commencement, not fall under the sway of attachment and aversion. Verily, that which is the 'nature' of a person goads him on to its business only through attachment and aversion; then, neglect of his own duty and undertaking the duty of another follows. When, on the other hand, one restrains attachment and aversion through their adversary,[47] then that man betakes himself to the scriptural point of

47. Attachment and aversion have their foundation (support) in false knowledge (*mithyā-Jñāna*). The adversary referred to is true knowledge (*viveka-vijñāna*), which is opposed to *mithyā-jñāna*. (Ā)

view alone and does not fall under the sway of (his) nature. Wherefore, *let no man come under their sway*, i.e. of attachment and aversion. *For, they are his*, man's *foes*: they are obstructions on his path to perfection, like robbers (on the highway).

Now, the man who is urged by attachment and aversion understands the teaching of the *Śāstra* to be otherwise (i.e. he misunderstands it), that the duty of another may also be performed, because it is also (prescribed) duty (dharma). That is wrong:

श्रेयान्स्वधर्मो विगुणः परधर्मात्स्वनुष्ठितात् ।
स्वधर्मे निधनं श्रेयः परधर्मो भयावहः ॥ ३५ ॥

Śreyān-svadharmo viguṇaḥ paradharmāt-svanuṣṭhitāt
Svadharme nidhanam śreyaḥ para-dharmo bhayāvahaḥ

35. Better one's own Dharma devoid of merit, than the Dharma of another well-performed. Better is death in one's own Dharma; the Dharma of another is productive of danger.

Better, more praiseworthy, is the performance of *one's own Dharma*, though the performance might be *devoid of merit, than the Dharma of another well-performed,* i.e. though accomplished with excellence[48]. *Better is* even *death in* acting up to *one's own Dharma,* than life set in doing the Dharma of another. Why so? For, *the Dharma of another is productive of danger*, risk, such as (going down to) hell.

Although the root-cause of evil has been referred to in the verse, "To the man thinking about objects" (II-62), and (here), "attachment and aversion are his foes" (III-34), it has been men-

48. The Lord thus definitely discountenances Arjuna's preference to living on food obtained by begging (II-5), prescribed as the dharma of *saṁnyāsins*, to engaging in fighting, which is the dharma of the Kṣatriya. (Ā)

tioned in disconnected contexts and without precision. Desiring to know that (cause of evil) compendiously and definitely, so that, on the cause being exactly known, he might endeavour to eradicate it—

अर्जुन उवाच—

अथ केन प्रयुक्तोऽयं पापं चरति पूरुषः ।
अनिच्छन्नपि वार्ष्णेय बलादिव नियोजितः ॥ ३६ ॥

Arjuna uvāca –

Atha kena prayukto (a) yam pāpam carati pūruṣaḥ
Anicchann-api vārṣṇeya balād-iva niyojitaḥ

Arjuna asked –

36. Now, O Vārṣṇeya! impelled by what does this man commit sin though reluctant, constrained as it were by force?

Now, O Varṣṇeya! Thou (Kṛṣṇa) born in the family of Vṛṣṇi, *impelled by what,* constituting the source, as a king with respect to (the action of) a servant, *does this man commit sin,* practise sinful áctions, *though* himself *reluctant, constrained as it were by force,* as (the servant) by the king, in the example?

The Blessed Lord said—"Do you hearken to (what I say concerning) the foe who is the cause of all evil, and of whom you ask":

श्री भगवानुवाच—

काम एष क्रोध एष रजोगुणसमुद्भवः ।
महाशनो महापाप्मा विद्ध्येनमिह वैरिणम् ॥ ३७ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca –

Kāma eṣa krodha eṣa rajoguṇa-samudbhavaḥ
Mahāśano mahāpāpma viddhyenam-iha vairiṇam

The Blessed Lord said –

37. It is desire, it is anger, born of *Rajo-guṇa ;* of great craving and of great sin ; know this as the foe here.

(Explanation of the word, Bhagavan:) Vāsudeva is called Bhagavān (usually rendered as the Blessed Lord), because in Him abide, for ever, the six attributes of sovereignty (*aiśvarya*) etc., without any obstruction and in their fullness ; as also because His especial knowledge encompasses all matters such as the origin of the universe,—as stated (in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*)—

"Bhaga means the collection of the six—(Properties)—complete sovereignty (*aiśvarya*), Dharma, glory (*yaśas*), splendour (Śri), dispassion (*vairāgya*) and liberation (*mokṣa*)". (VI-v-74).

"He is called Bhagavan who knows the origin, and the dissolution, the coming and the going of beings, wisdom and non-wisdom. (VI-v-78).

(Commentary on the verse proper:) *It,* that which is the foe of all the worlds, which brings about all the evils of living beings, *is desire;* this desire itself, when frustrated or obstructed by some cause, is transformed into anger, and therefore *anger* also *is it*, the foe. Desire is *born of Rajoguṇa;* for when desire arises, it sets Rajas in motion and thereby urges man to action. We actually hear the lamentation of miserable persons who empty themselves in servitude and the like, products of rajo-guṇa, "By desire have I been forced to act (in this manner)". (Desire is) *of great craving;* it demands much feeding; *and* because of this, (it is) *of great sin.* Indeed, prompted by desire, does man commit sin. Therefore, *know this* desire *as the foe here*, in this world (saṁsāra).

In what manner it is (man's) foe is shown through examples :

धूमेनाव्रियते वह्निर्यथादर्शो मलेन च ।
यथोल्बेनावृतो गर्भस्तथा तेनेदमावृतम् ॥ ३८ ॥

Dhumenāvriyate vanhiḥ yathā darśo malena ca
Yatholbenāvṛto garbhas-tathā tenedam āvṛtam

38. As fire is enveloped by smoke, as a mirror (is) by dust, as an embryo is covered by the secundine, so is this covered by that.

As fire, which is bright, *is enveloped by smoke* which is produced with it and is dark, and *as a mirror* is *by dust, as an embryo is covered by the secundine,* the outer skin surrounding it, *so is this covered by that.*

What is it, referred to as 'this' which is covered by desire? The answer is:

आवृतं ज्ञानमेतेन ज्ञानिनो नित्यवैरिणा ।
कामरूपेण कौन्तेय दुष्पूरेणानलेन च ॥ ३९ ॥

Āvṛtam jñānam-etena jñānino nitya-vairiṇā
Kāmarūpeṇa Kaunteya duṣpūreṇānalena ca

39. O son of Kuntī! Knowledge is covered by this, the constant foe of the wise, in the form of desire, difficult to satisfy, and never having enough.

Knowledge is covered by this, the constant foe of the wise: The wise man knows even at the very beginning that he is being led to evil by this (desire) and therefore feels miserable always. Hence, this (desire) is the constant foe of the wise man. Not so is the case with the ignorant; for he sees desire as his friend when he hankers after something; and only when an unpleasant result ensues does he realise, "Through desire I have become miserable", and not earlier. Wherefore is this (desire) the constant foe of the wise man alone.

Of what form (is the foe)? *In the form of desire* (icchā[40]), *difficult to satisfy, and never having enough,* never attaining satiety.

The Lord proceeds to say where desire, which by covering Knowledge is the foe of all, has its location. For, when the seat of a foe is known, it would be easy to destroy him.

इन्द्रियाणि मनो बुद्धिरस्याधिष्ठानमुच्यते ।
एतैर्विमोहयत्येप ज्ञानमावृत्य देहिनम् ॥ ४० ॥

Indriyāṇi mano buddhir-asyādhiṣṭhānam-ucyate
Etair-vimohayatyeṣa Jñānam-āvṛtya dehinam

40. The senses the mind, and the intellect are said to be its abode. Through these, it deludes the embodied, by veiling (his) wisdom.

The senses, the mind, and the intellect are said to be its abode, the resting place of desire. *Through these,* senses and other resting places, *it,* desire, *deludes* in various ways *the embodied,* man, *by veiling, covering,* his *wisdom.*

Wherefore,

तस्मात्त्वमिन्द्रियाण्यादौ नियम्य भरतर्षभ ।
पाप्मानं प्रजहि ह्येनं ज्ञानविज्ञाननाशनम् ॥ ४१ ॥

Tasmāt-tvam-indriyāṇyādau niyamya Bharatarṣabha
Pāpmānam prajahi-hyenam-jñānavi jñāna-nāśanam

41. Therefore, O Bull of the Bharata race, do you, restraining the senses at the outset, cast away this sinful thing, the destroyer of Knowledge and Realisation.

49. For definition, see XIII,6 Com.

Therefore, O Bull of the Bharata race, do you, restraining the senses, bringing them under control *at the outset,*[50] *cast away this sinful thing,* the foe under discussion, namely desire, which follows evil or sinful courses, *the destroyer of Knowledge and Realisation.* Knowledge (Jñāna) is the perception of (becoming awake to the Self and other (relevant) matters, derived from the śāstra (Scripture) and the Teacher. Realisation (vijñāna) is the especial (personal) experience of that teaching. The instruction is: knowledge and Realisation are the means to the attainment of supreme felicity; do you cast away from yourself their destroyer.

It has been taught, "controlling the senses at the outset, cast away desire, the enemy". Resting on what is desire to be cast off, is being stated:

इन्द्रियाणि पराण्याहुरिन्द्रियेभ्यः परं मनः ।
मनसस्तु परा बुद्धिर्यो बुद्धेः परतस्तु सः ॥ ४२ ॥

Indriyāṇi parāṇyahur-indriyebhyaḥ param manaḥ
Manasastu parā buddhir-yo buddheh paratastu saḥ

42. They say the senses are superior; superior to the senses is mind; superior to the mind is the intellect; he who is superior to the intellect is He.

They the wise, *say* that *the senses,* the five, hearing and the others, *are superior* as compared to the physical body, which is gross, external and circumscribed; they are superior by reason of their subtlely, internal situation and pervasiveness. So also, *superior to the senses is mind* (manas), characterised by volition and indecision. In the same way, *superior to the mind is the intellect* (buddhi), characterised by resolution. So also, *he who is superior to the intellect,* interior to all perceivable objects inclusive of the intellect, the embodied spirit (generally taken to be the individual, Jīva)—whom it has been stated—desire, resting

50. In the preliminary stage, before destroying desire ; because, only when the senses are under control, will it be possible to subdue the mind and the intellect. (Ā)

in the senses and other places, deludes by veiling his wisdom, *is He*, the Witness of the intellect, the Supreme Self.

एवं बुद्धेः परं बुद्ध्वा संस्तभ्यात्मानमात्मना ।
जहि शत्रुं महाबाहो कामरूपं दुरासदम् ॥ ४३ ॥

Evam buddheh param buddhvā samstabhyātmānam-ātmanā
Jahi śatrum mahābāho kāma rūpam durāsadam

43. Thus, O mighty-armed, knowing Him who is the superior of the intellect, and steadying the self by the self, destroy (this) enemy in the form of desire, so difficult to overtake.

Thus, O mighty-armed, knowing, comprehending, *Him,* the Self, *who is the superior of the intellect, and steadying,* fixing firmly, *the self by the self,* i.e. effecting perfect composure of mind by your own purified mind, do you *destroy this enemy in the form of desire, so difficult to overtake,* reaching whom is beset with great difficulty, on account of its incomprehensible and multifarious peculiarities.

इति श्रीमहाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्यां भीष्मपर्वणि
श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु ब्रह्मविद्यायां योगशास्त्रे
श्रीकृष्णार्जुनसंवादे कर्मयोगो नाम
तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥

Iti Śrī Mahābhārate śata sāhasryām samhitāyām Vaiyāsikyām
Bhīṣma-Parvaṇi Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītāsūpaniṣatsu
Brahma-vidyāyām yogaśāstre Śri Kṛṣṇārjuna-
Samvāde Karma-yogo nāma
tṛtīyo (a) dhyāyaḥ

Thus the third chapter entitled 'The Way of Action,'[51] in the Upaniṣads known as 'The Celebrated Songs of the Lord' expounding the Knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna embodied in the Bhīṣma Parva of Śri Māhābharata, the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyāsa

51. This chapter is entitled 'Eulogy of Action' (*Karma-praśamsā*) in the Commentary.

॥ चतुर्थोऽध्यायः ॥

(ज्ञानकर्मसंन्यास योगः)

CATURTHOADHYAYAḤ
JÑĀNA-KARMA-SAṀNYĀSA YOGAḤ

CHAPTER - IV

(WAY OF RENUNCIATION OF ACTION IN KNOWLEDGE)

In the two (preceding) Chapters has been taught the *Yoga* of devotion to Knowledge with renunciation, attainable through *Karma-yoga* as the means. Therein is comprehended the Vedic teaching concerning activity and retirement; and it is this very same (*Jñāna-Yoga*) which is intended by the Lord as (*THE*) Yoga throughout the *Gītās*. Therefore, holding that the purport of the Veda has been completely taught, the Lord glorifies it by narrating the tradition.

श्रीभगवानुवाच—

इमं विवस्वते योगं प्रोक्तवानहमव्ययम् ।
विवस्वान्मनवे प्राहमनुरिक्ष्वाकवेऽब्रवीत् ॥ १ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Imam Vivasvate yogam proktavān-aham-avyayam
Vivasvān Manave prāha Manur-Ikṣvākave (a) bravīt

The Blessed Lord said—

1. I told (taught) this imperishable Yoga to Vivasvat; Vivasvat told it to Manu; Manu told it to Ikṣvāku.

I told this imperishable Yoga related in the previous two Chapters, to *Vivasvat,* the Sun-god (Āditya), at the beginning of creation, for imparting strength to Kṣatriyas, the protectors of the world, so that possessed of its strength they will become competent to protect the Brāhmaṇas. And when the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas are sustained, the maintenance of the world becomes easily possible.

This Yoga is imperishable, because its fruit is imperishable. Indeed, mokṣa, the fruit of this devotion to Perfect Knowledge, never perishes.

And he, *Vivasvat, told it to Manu;* and *Manu told it to* his son Ikṣvāku, the first sovereign.

एवं परम्पराप्राप्तमिमं राजर्षयो विदुः ।
स कालेनेह महता योगो नष्टः परन्तप ॥ २ ॥

Evam paramparā-prāptam-imam rajarṣayo viduḥ
Sa kāleneha mahatā yogo naṣṭaḥ parantapa

2. Thus handed down in regular succession, the royal sages knew this. By long lapse of time, that Yoga has been lost here, O scorcher of foes.

Thus handed down in regular succession among Kṣatriyas, *the royal* sages, those who were kings and also sages at the same time, *knew this* Yoga. *By long lapse of time,*[1] *that Yoga has been lost here* (at present); the tradition has become interrupted, O *burner of fees.* you who cause distress to enemies, those on the opposite side ;—like the sun, by (the rays of) the splendour of your prowess.[2]

Seeing that the Yoga has been lost at the hands of the weak with uncontrolled senses, and that people had become dissociated from the (supreme) object of life—

1. See Introduction and note 13 thereto.

2. *Śauryam:* for definition, see XVIII-43 Com.

स एवायं मया तेऽद्य योगः प्रोक्तः पुरातनः ।
भक्तोऽसि मे सखा चेति रहस्यं ह्येतदुत्तमम् ॥ ३ ॥

Sa evāyam mayā te(a)dya yogaḥ proktaḥ purātanaḥ
Bhakto (a) si me sakhā ceti rahasyam hyetad-uttamam

3. That same ancient[3] Yoga has now been taught to you by Me, as you are My devotee and My friend; for, this is the supreme secret.

That same ancient Yoga has now, at the present moment, *been taught to you by Me, as you are My devotee and My friend; for,* indeed, *this* Yoga, Knowledge, *is the supreme secret.*

Lest anyone should form the opinion that the Lord has made a self-contradictory statement, and being desirous of preventing such opinion being formed, and seemingly raising an objection—

अर्जुन उवाच—
अपरं भवतो जन्म परं जन्म विवस्वतः ।
कथमेतद्विजानीयां त्वमादौ प्रोक्तवानिति ॥ ४ ॥

Arjuna uvāca—

Aparam bhavato janma param janma Vivasvataḥ
Katham-etad-vijānīyam tvam-adau proktavān-iti

Arjuna said—

4. Later was Thy birth; and the birth of Vivasvat prior; how then should I understand that Thou toldest this in the beginning?

3. Because it originates from the eternal Veda. (Ā)

Later, in the house of Vasudeva, *was Thy birth; and the birth of Vivasvat*, the Sun-god, *prior*, at the beginning of creation. *How then should I understand* as being consistent in import, *that Thou* Thyself *toldest this* Yoga *in the beginning*, and that self-same person art Thou who hast now taught me.

To remove the disbelief of the stupid that Vāsudeva is not the Omnipotent and Omniscient—which was indeed the object of Arjuna's question,

श्री भगवानुवाच—
बहूनि मे व्यतीतानि जन्मानि तव चार्जुन ।
तान्यहं वेद सर्वाणि न त्वं वेत्थ परन्तप॥ ५ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Bahūni me vyatītāni janmani tava cārjuna
Tānyevāham veda sarvāṇi na tvam vettha parantapa

The Blessed Lord said—

5. Many are the births that have been passed by Me and by you, O Arjuna. I know them all, while you know not, O scorcher of foes!

Many are the births that have been passed—they are things of the past—*by Me and by you, O Arjuna. I know them all, while you know not*, because the power of your intellect is obscured by (your) dharma and adharma (impressions of past good and bad actions) etc. But I know them, because of My unobscured power of knowledge, I being by nature Eternal, Pure, Intelligent and Free, *O scorcher of foes*.

How then dost Thou, the Eternal Lord, have a birth, even though there be no dharma and adharma for you? The reply is:

अजोऽपि सन्नव्ययात्मा भूतानामीश्वरोऽपि सन् ।
प्रकृतिंस्वामधिष्ठाय सम्भवाम्यात्ममायया ॥ ६ ॥

Ajo(a)pi sann-avyayātma bhūtanām-īśvaro(a)pi san
Prakṛtim svām-adhiṣṭhāya sambhavāmyātma-
māyayā

6. Though I am the Unborn, of changeless nature, and Lord of beings, yet, subjugating My Prakṛti, I come into being by My own Māyā.

Though I am the Unborn, bereft of birth; so also, *of changeless nature*, though by nature I possess undiminishing power of knowledge; *and* also, *the Lord of beings*, capable of governing all beings from Brahmā down to a blade of grass; *yet, subjugating*, controlling, *My Prakrti*—Māyā[4] belonging to Myself as Viṣṇu, comprised of the three Guṇas, to whose power the entire universe is subject, and deluded by whom one does not realise his own Self which is the same as Vāsudeva,—*I come into being,* I become as if possessed of a body and as if I am born, *by My own Māyā,* and not in fact as is the case with the world (creatures).

At what time and for what purpose is such birth (of the Lord)? The answer follows:

यदा यदा हि धर्मस्य ग्लानिर्भवति भारत ।
अभ्युत्थानमधर्मस्य तदाऽऽत्मानं सृजाम्यहम् ॥ ७ ॥

Yadā yadā hi dharmasya glānir-bhavati Bhārata
Abhyutthānam-adharmasya tadā (ā) tmanam
sṛjāmyaham

7. Whenever, O descendant of Bharata, there is decline of dharma and rise of adharma, then I embody Myself forth.

Whenever, O descendant of Bharata, there is decline of dharma, religion, in the form of the institution of castes (varṇas), religious orders (āśramas), etc.[5], as the means to worldly prosperity and

4. See Introduction and note 19 thereto.

5. *Ācāras.* (Ā) i.e. established usages, customary laws. Religion or dharma is mainly maintained by *varṇa-āśrama* rules and *ācāras*. See note 11 and 12 of Introduction.

supreme felicity for human beings, *and rise of adharma*, i.e. the ascendancy of irreligion, *then I embody Myself forth*, through Māyā.

For what purpose ?

परित्राणाय साधूनां विनाशाय च दुष्कृताम् ।
धर्मसंस्थापनार्थाय संभवामि युगे युगे ॥ ८ ॥

Paritrāṇāya sādhūnām vināśāya ca duṣkṛtām
Dharma-samsthāpanārthāya sambhavāmi yuge yuge

8. For the protection of the good, for the destruction of the wicked, and for the firm establishment of dharma, I come into being in every age.

For the protection, preservation, *of the good*, those following the right path; *for the destruction of the wicked*, those who commit sinful or vicious acts; and for what else? *for the firm establishment of dharma*, i.e. for setting it up well, *I come into being in every age*.

That,

जन्म कर्म च मे दिव्यमेवं यो वेत्ति तत्त्वतः ।
त्यक्त्वा देहं पुनर्जन्म नैति मामेति सोऽर्जुन ॥ ९ ॥

Janma karma ca me divyam-evam yo vetti tattvatah
Tyaktvā deham punar janma naiti mam-eti
so(a)rjuna

9. My divine birth and action, who knows thus, truly, on leaving the body he is not born again: he attains to Me, O Arjuna.

My divine, not derived from nature (*aprākṛtam*) and special to Īśvara, *birth*, of illusory form,[6] *and action*, such as protection of

6. See Introduction and note 15 and 16 thereto.

the good, *who knows thus, truly,* in their true light, as stated, *on leaving the body,* i.e. this (the present) body, *he is not born again,* he does not get another birth: *he attains to Me,* comes to Me; he is liberated, *O Arjuna.*

This path to salvation is not being laid just now, but has been (trodden) even in the past—

वीतराग भयक्रोधा मन्मया मामुपाश्रिताः ।
बहवो ज्ञानतपसा पूता मद्भावमागताः ॥ १० ॥

Vīta-rāga-bhaya-krodhā man-mayā mām-upāśritaḥ
Bahavo jñāna-tapasā pūtā mad-bhāvam-āgatāḥ

10. Freed from attachment, fear and anger, absorbed in Me, taking refuge in Me, purified by the fire of Knowledge, many have attained by Being.

Freed from attachment, fear and anger, i.e. attachment, fear and anger have disappeared from them; *absorbed in Me,* i.e. they are knowers of Brahman and see their non-difference (identity) with Īśvara; *taking refuge in Me,* the Supreme Lord (Parameś-vara);—that is to say, they are intensely devoted to Knowledge alone; *purified by the fire of Knowledge*—Knowledge concerning the Supreme Self is itself the tapas (austerity; fire—having attained final purification thereby, *many have attained My Being,* oneness with Īśvara, i.e. mokṣa (liberation). The phrase, 'purified by the fire of Knowledge' indicates that devotion to Knowledge has no need of other austerities.

The question may arise:

"Then, Thou (the Lord) art swayed by the feelings of attachment and aversion, because Thou grantest (Thy) Self-hood (*mokṣa*) to a few only and not to all?" The answer follows:

ये यथा मां प्रपद्यन्ते तांस्तथैव भजाम्यहम् ।
मम वर्त्मानुवर्तन्ते मनुष्याः पार्थ सर्वशः ॥ ११ ॥

Ye yathā mām prapadyante tāms-tathaiva bhajāmyaham

Mama vartmānuvartante manuṣyāḥ Pārtha sarvaśaḥ

11. In whatever way men worship Me, in the same way do I reward them; (it is) My path, O son of Pṛthā, (that) men tread in all ways.

In whatever way, in what manner, with what aim, desiring what result, *men worship Me, in the same way* only, by granting the desired result, *I reward,* favour *them*; for they do not wish for mokṣa. Verily, one cannot be a seeker after mokṣa and at the same time have a desire for fruits. Therefore, I favour those who are after fruits by granting them the desired fruits; those who do not seek the fruit (of their action) but perform their prescribed duties, desiring (only) liberation, by granting (them) knowledge; those who possess (true) Knowledge and having renounced the world desire liberation, by granting them liberation (mokṣa); so also those who are distressed, by relieving them from distress. Thus do I favour all, only in the way that they resort to Me[7]; but I never favour anybody on account of attachment or aversion or as a mistake.

In all matters, it is *My path,* that of Īśvara, who abides in all forms,[8] *O Partha,* that *men tread, in all ways.* By ' men ' is meant all those who exert themselves in the actions enjoined on them, appropriate to the result desired.

Question: If in Thee, the Lord, on account of the absence of blemishes such as attachment, there is the uniform desire to favour all beings alike, as also the capacity to grant all desired fruits, then, why do not all seek after liberation and betake themselves to Thee alone, with the knowledge 'Vāsudeva is all'?

7. The four kinds of devotees—vide VII-16.

8. See IX-23, 24.

Reply: Listen to the reason therefor—

कांक्षन्तः कर्मणां सिद्धिं यजन्त इह देवताः ।
क्षिप्रं हि मानुषे लोके सिद्धिर्भवति कर्मजा ॥ १२ ॥

Kāmkṣantaḥ karmaṇām siddhim yajanta iha devatāḥ
Kṣipram hi mānuṣe loke siddhir-bhavati karmajā

12. Longing for success in actions, here, (men) worship the gods. Because success, resulting from action, is quickly attained in the human world.

Longing for success in actions, soliciting the accomplishment of the fruit of actions, *here*, in this world, *men worship the gods*, Indra, Agni and others, as the Śruti says: "He , on the other hand, who worships a god different (from the Self), with the idea, 'he is separate from me and I am separate from him', he knows not he is to the Devas as cattle" (*Bṛ.* I-iv-10). Indeed, by those who are intent after fruits, and worship gods (as) different (from their Self) (for the attainment of those fruits), success is quickly attained in the human world, because the injunctions of the Śāstras are confined to the world of human beings only. By this, (by saying: "*quickly*" *in the human world*) the Lord indicates that, even in other worlds, there is attainment of the results of action (though not quickly). The difference is that in the world of men, the performance of action is regulated by the institution of castes and religious orders; and *success resulting from* action, the fruit of actions performed by persons duly authorised in accordance with the rules of castes and religious orders, *is quickly attained.*

Question: What is the reason for the law that, only in the world of men, the performance of actions is regulated by the institution of castes and religious orders etc., but not in other worlds? Or, rather; it has been stated that, men classified according to castes and religious orders, etc. follow Thy ('My' in the text) path in all ways; for what reason should they necessarily follow Thy path alone, but not that of any other?

The answer is:

चातुर्वर्ण्यं मया सृष्टं गुणकर्मविभागशः ।
तस्य कर्तारमपि मां विद्ध्यकर्तारमव्ययम् ॥ १३ ॥

cātur-varṇyam mayā sṛṣṭam guṇa-karma-vibhāgaśaḥ
Tasya kartāram-api mām-viddhyakartāram-avyayam

13. The fourfold caste was created by Me, by the differentiation of Guṇa and karma. Though I am the author thereof, know Me to be the non-doer and the changeless.

The fourfold caste, the aggregate of the four castes, *was created by Me,* as stated in the Śruti: "The Brāhmaṇa was His mouth, etc." (R. V. X-90-12), *by the differentiation of Guṇa and karma,* according to the distribution of the guṇas—sattva, rajas and tamas—, and according to the distribution of work (activities). The karmas[9] of the Brāhmaṇa, the good in whom (sattva: goodness) predominates, are tranquillity, self-restraint, austerity, etc. (XVIII-42). The karmas of the Kṣatriya, in whom rajas (activity) predominates eclipsing sattva, are prowess, boldness, etc. (XVIII-43). The duties of the Vaiśya, in whom rajas predominates eclipsing tamas (darkness), are agriculture, etc. (XVIII-44). The duty of the Śūdra, in whom tamas predominates eclipsing rajas, is service alone. Thus the fourfold caste has been created by Me in accordance with the differences in Guṇa and karma. This fourfold caste does not exist in the other worlds; hence the qualification, 'in the human world' (in the previous verse).

Objection: Alas, then, by being the author of the act of creation etc. of the fourfold caste Thou art tied to its consequences and therefore Thou cannot be the ever-free and eternal Lord.

9. The *karmas* denote not only the duties by way of activities, but also the proclivities of the doer.

Reply: Though I am the author thereof, of that act, functioning through an illusory activity (the activity of Māyā), *know Me* in reality *to be the non-doer*, and therefore, *the changeless*, one not subject to saṁsāra.

With regard to the actions of which you think I am the author, I am in reality not their agent (doer), because:

न मां कर्माणि लिम्पन्ति न मे कर्मफले स्पृहा ।
इति मां योऽभिजानाति कर्मभिर्न स बध्यते ॥ १४ ॥

Na mām karmāṇi limpanti na me karma phale spṛhā
Iti mām yo(a)bhijānāti karmabhir-na sa badhyate

14. Actions do not taint Me, nor have I any craving for the result of action. He who knows Me thus is not fettered by action.

Those *actions do not taint Me*, by causing the production of a body etc.[10], because of the absence of egoism (in Me). *Nor have I any craving for the result of* those *actions*. With regard to the worldly men (saṁsārins), who have the feeling 'I am the doer' and the craving for doing work and for its fruits, it is but meet that actions should taint them; on the other hand, because of the absence of these, actions do not taint Me. *He*, i.e. any other person also, *who knows Me*, his very Self, *thus*, i.e. as, "I am no doer, nor have I any craving for the result of action", he, *is not fettered by action*: for him also, actions do not cause the production of a body etc.

"I am no agent (doer), nor have I any craving for the result of action"—

एवं ज्ञात्वा कृतं कर्म पूर्वैरपि मुमुक्षुभिः ।
कुरु कर्मैव तस्मात्त्वं पूर्वैः पूर्वतरं कृतम् ॥ १५ ॥

10. 'Etc.' refers to *indriyas* (sense-organs) and the rest. (Ā)

Evam jñātva kṛtam karma pūrvair-api mumukṣubhih

Kuru karmaiva tasmāt-tvam pūrvaiḥ pūrva-taram kṛtam

15. Knowing thus, was action performed even by the ancient seekers after liberation. Do you, therefore, surely perform action, as did the ancients in olden times.

Knowing thus, was action performed even by the ancient seekers after liberation. Do you, therefore, for that reason, i.e. because action was performed by the ancients even, *surely perform action*: neither sitting-quiet nor renunciation-of-action should be resorted to (by you); If you have not known the Self, (perform action) for the purification of (your) mind; if you know the truth about the Self, for the guidance of the world—*as did the ancients,* such as Janaka, *in olden times*: this (course of conduct) is not of recent origin.

(To Arjuna's enquiry,) "Here,[11] if action must be performed, I shall do so merely at Thy command; why dost Thou qualify it by saying 'as did the ancients in olden times?' ",—(the Lord replies:) because, there is great difficulty (in understanding) about (what constitutes) action. How?

किं कर्म किमकर्मेति कवयोऽप्यत्र मोहिताः ।
तत्ते कर्म प्रवक्ष्यामि यज्ज्ञात्वा मोक्ष्यसेऽशुभात् ॥ १६ ॥

Kim karma kim-akarmeti kavayo(a)pyatra mohitāh

Tat te karma pravakṣyāmi yaj-jñātva mokṣyase (a) śubhāt

11. In this human world. (Ā)

16. Even sages are bewildered as to what is action and what is inaction. I shall therefore tell you what action is, by knowing which you will be freed from evil.

Even sages, endowed with intellect (medhā), *are bewildered*, fall into error, *as to what is action and what is inaction. Therefore, I shall tell you what action is,* and also what inaction is, *by knowing which*—karma (action), etc.—*you will be freed from evil*, i.e. saṁsāra.

And, you should not also think like this : " Action is surely that which is well-known as movements of the body, etc., inaction is the non-execution of such movements and sitting quiet; what is there to understand in this? " Why? Because—

कर्मणोह्यपि बोद्धव्यं बोद्धव्यं च विकर्मणः ।
अकर्मणश्च बोद्धव्यं गहना कर्मणो गतिः ॥ १७ ॥

Karmaṇo-hyapi boddhavyam boddhavyam ca vikarmanaḥ
Akarmaṇaśca boddhavyam gahanā karmaṇo gatiḥ

17. For, verily (there is) to be known (the true nature) even of action, as (is) also (that) of forbidden action, and (that) of inaction; the nature of karma is impenetrable.

For, verily there is *to be known* the true nature *even of action*, enjoined by the Śāstras, *as* is *also* that *of forbidden action*, that which is prohibited, *and* that *of inaction*, of keeping quiet. Because, *the nature*, the true character, *of karma*, i.e. action, inaction and forbidden action, *is impenetrable*, mysterious, hard to understand.

What then is the true nature of action etc., which has to be known and which The Lord has promised to tell? Listen:

कर्मण्यकर्म यः पश्येदकर्मणि च कर्म यः ।
स बुद्धिमान्मनुष्येषु स युक्तः कृत्स्नकर्मकृत् ॥ १८ ॥

Karmaṇyakarma yaḥ paśyed-akarmaṇi ca karma yaḥ

Sa buddhimān-manuṣyeṣu sa yuktaḥ krtsna-karmakṛt

18. He who can see inaction in action, and action in inaction, he is intelligent among men, he is a Yogi, and a doer of all action (accomplisher of all objects).

He, who can see, i.e. sees, *inaction,* absence of action, *in action,* that which is done, namely mere engagement, movement, *and action in inaction,* in the absence of action;—

Action (pravṛtti) and absence of (withdrawal from) action (nivṝtti) are both dependent on an agent (doer—kartā); and all business involving action, agent, etc. has its due place in the domain of ignorance (avidyā), when the Reality (vastu) has not yet been perceived[12].

(Therefore,) *he,* who sees action in inaction, and vice versa, *is intelligent among men, he is a Yogi,* a saint who has become one with the Self, *and a doer of all action* (accomplisher of all objects):—thus he is glorified.

Objection:—What does this incongruous teaching— 'one who can see inaction in action and action in inaction mean'? Verily, action cannot become inaction, nor can inaction become action; and so, how can one understand what is (thus) incompatible?

12. (*Vastu aprāpya eva*). According to Ānandagiri, this means: even the dissociation of connection with a positive entity (*vastu saṁsparśa sūnyatva*) amounts to an activity (because of the presence of the egotistic concept of agency).

Reply:—That which in reality is 'inaction' (non-active)[13] appears as with 'action' (to be active) to the common man of the world who has a mistaken perception; so also does 'action' appear as 'inaction'. Therefore, with a view to teaching the exact truth, the Lord says, 'he who can see inaction in action, etc.'; thus, there is no incongruity. It is also appropriate that one who sees as stated should be called intelligent, etc. And the knowledge of the exact truth is what has been referred to as the(proper) object to be known (verse 17). The Lord has also stated, "by knowing which you will be freed from evil" (verse 16); but freedom from evil cannot be attained through wrong knowledge. Therefore, (it is to be understood that) because action and inaction are wrongly comprehended by ordinary men, the Lord's words, "he who can see inaction in action, etc." are intended to remove that wrong comprehension. Moreover, here, neither is inaction the locus (receptacle) for action, nor is action the locus (receptacle) for inaction, as is indicated in the statement, 'in the basin there are jujube fruits'; for 'inaction 'is (simply) the absence of 'action'. Therefore, (we have to conclude that) action and inaction are wrongly comprehended by ordinary men just as water (is seen) in the mirage or silver in the mother-of-pearl.

Objection:—Is not 'action' ever the same to all, never departing from its nature anywhere?

Reply: Not so. To a person in a boat, when the boat is moving, trees which are stationary on the bank appear to move in the opposite direction. Distant objects, remote to the eye, though moving, are seen as devoid of motion (i.e. appear to be stationary). So also here, action is seen in the actionless (Self), under the idea: 'I do (this)'; and inaction is seen in action[14]:—thus, contrary perception takes place. And to remove this (wrong perception) the Lord says, 'he who can see inaction in action etc.'

Though this subject has been taught more than once in reply (to objections), ordinary people being deluded through cherishing very strong misconceptions forget the Truth though often

13. *Akarma—akriyam* (bereft of action) i.e. Brahman. (Ā)

14. Inactivity is associated with the world of duality, which is ever active. (Ā)

heard by them, and bringing up wrong arguments raise doubts again and again. So, seeing that the truth about the Self is difficult to understand, the Lord also answers (such objections) again and again.

(To sum up:) The truth that the Self is devoid of action, so well established by Śruti, Smṛti and Nyāya,[15] has been taught in the verses, "This (Self) is said to be unmanifested, unthinkable" (II-25), "This (Self) is never born; nor does it ever die" (II-20), etc.; and it will be taught hereafter also. In such Self bereft of action, i.e. in (Self's) 'inaction', the perception of action, which is contrary (to its real nature) has become quite natural with people; and so, "even sages are bewildered as to what is action and what is inaction" (IV-16). And, attributing action, which rests on the body etc., to the Self, (man thinks) "I am the doer, this duty (action) is for me; I must enjoy its fruit". Also, in the same way man thinks, "I shall remain quiet, so that I may be free from fatigue, doing nothing and happy" thus attributing to the Self abstinence from activity, which relates to the body and the senses, and the feeling of happiness ensuing therefrom; and prides himself: 'I am doing nothing now, I am quiet and happy". To cure mankind of this wrong perception, the Lord teaches: "he who can see inaction in action, etc."

Now, 'action', being always of the nature of activity and resting on the body and the senses, is superimposed by everybody on the Self, which is devoid of action and is unchangeable; and so, even a learned man thinks, "I am doing". Thus, the meaning (of the verse) is:

In action, which is considered by common folk as inherent in the Self,—just as motion in the opposite direction is attributed to the (stationary) trees on the bank of the river,—*he who sees inaction,* absence of action (in the Self), as is the exact truth,—just as seeing the absence of motion (in the case) of the trees; *and in inaction,* in the cessation of movement of the body and the senses, which also like action is attributed to the Self, *sees action,* productive of the self-conceit, "quiet and doing nothing, I am resting happy"; he who thus understands the difference between

15. Reason, Logic (see note 24, Introduction).

action and inaction, as thus explained *he is intelligent among men*, a paṇḍita (wise man), *he is a Yogi, and a doer of all action*—he has done his duty (accomplished all objects), that is to say, he is freed from evil (falling into hell).

This verse has been differently interpreted by another commentator.[16] How? The obligatory rites, being performed for the sake of the Lord, do not indeed produce their fruit and therefore they are, in a figurative sense, said (by that commentator) to be 'inaction' (non-action). Their non-performance is inaction; and that is also figuratively said (by him) to be 'action', because it results in the sin of non-performance (*pratyavāya*). Accordingly he who sees 'inaction' in the obligatory rites, because they produce no fruits,—just as a cow, though not ceasing to be a cow, is not considered a cow by reason of its not yielding produce in the form of milk—and in the same way sees 'action' in inaction, the non-performance of obligatory rites, by reason of its producing sinful result such as hell (naraka), etc.... (i.e., such an one according to that interpretation, is intelligent among men etc.)

This interpretation is not correct, since through such knowledge freedom from evil (falling into hell) cannot be attained, and the Lord's declaration, "by knowing which you will be freed from evil" (IV-16) will be stultified. How? Because, though by the performance of the obligatory rites there may possibly be freedom from evil, it (freedom from evil) can never be had by the (mere) knowledge that they do not produce any fruit. Indeed, it has nowhere been taught (in the Śāstra) that either the knowledge that obligatory rites produce no fruit, or the knowledge about the obligatory rites (themselves) results in freedom from evil. Nor has such been taught by the Lord here.

By the same argument, (the interpretation regarding) seeing action in inaction stands refuted. Indeed (according to that commentator), it is not enjoined here that non-performance (of obligatory rites) should be viewed as action, but merely that obligatory rites should be performed. Neither is there anything to be gained by knowing that sin accrues from non-performance

16. The reference is to the Vṛttikāra. (A)

of obligatory rites; nor can the non-performance of obligatory rites have been taught as fit to be known[17]. Besides, by seeing contrarily action as inaction (and inaction as action,—in the sense explained by that commentator), it will not be possible (for anybody) to obtain results such as freedom from evil, getting endowed with intelligence, becoming a Yogi, and accomplishment of all objects; and such (false) understanding deserves no praise. False knowledge is itself evil in nature; how can it free (one) from another evil? Surely, darkness cannot expel darkness.

Objection:—(What is explained by us as) seeing inaction in action, or seeing action in inaction, is not false knowledge, but is only a figurative way of understanding, depending on the production and non-production of result.

Reply:—This is no good; for it is nowhere heard that even a figurative understanding of action and inaction is of any use. Nor is anything special gained by ignoring what has been taught and inventing what has not been taught[18]. If the Lord had meant it, He could as well have said in His own words that there is no fruit from obligatory rites and that their neglect will result in falling into hell. And, why (should He resort to) covert language, confounding others: " he who can see inaction in action, etc.?"

Therefore the interpretation of the (other) commentator will patently imply that the Lord's words were intended to confound mankind. Neither is this subject (performance of obligatory duties) a matter to be guarded by the use of disguised language, nor can it be said to be one which could be clearly understood only when taught over and over again in different words. For, the matter which has been very clearly taught in the passage, " Your right is to work alone " (II-47), needs no repetition. And it is always only what is excellent and commendable, and what is worthy of performance, that is taught as fit to be known; not that which is of no use.

17. If it should be enjoined that non-performance should be viewed as action then non-performance, being the principal thing, should be taught as that on which to fix attention; but that is impossible, because it is a non-entity (*tuccha*). (Ā)

18. What is taught is that freedom from evil results from true Knowledge; what has not been taught is about the performance of obligatory rites. (Ā)

Nor is false knowledge worthy of comprehension, as also the object awakened in the memory by that (false knowledge), which is unreal. Also, from the non-entity, viz., the non-performance of obligatory rites, the positive entity of sin (*pratyavāya*) cannot arise,—as has been stated: " Of the un-real, there is no existence " (II-16). *Śruti* also says: " How can existence come out of non-existence?" (*Ch.* VI-ii-2). That existence can arise out of non-existence has thus been denied; still, to maintain that from non-existence a real object can spring up is to say that non-existence itself is existence and vice-versa; and this is improper, being opposed to all reason.

Besides, Scripture cannot prescribe any action which is unprofitable, because all action involves trouble, and what involves trouble is not taken up intentionally as a duty to be performed[19]. And, by not performing the obligatory rites, falling into hell is to be suffered; so that, in either case—performing or neglecting (obligatory duties)—the Scripture is presented as the source of harm and therefore unprofitable. Moreover, there is inconsistency of approach in (first) admitting that obligatory rights produce no fruit and then declaring that they lead to mokṣa (liberation).

Therefore (it is established that) the meaning of " he who can see inaction in action, etc. " is as learnt (in our tradition); and the verse has been interpreted by us accordingly.

This perception of inaction in action, and vice versa, is glorified as follows:—

यस्य सर्वे समारम्भाः कामसंकल्प वर्जिताः ।
ज्ञानाग्निदग्ध कर्माणं तमाहुः पण्डितं बुधाः ॥ १९ ॥

Yasya sarve samārambhāḥ kāma-saṁkalpa-varjitāḥ
Jñānāgni-dagdha-karmāṇam tam-āhuḥ paṇḍitam budhāḥ

19. in the absence of a desirable fruit, such as attaining to heaven. (Ā)

19. Him the sages call Wise, whose undertakings are all devoid of desires (for results) and plans; and whose actions are burnt by the fire of Knowledge.

Whose, i.e., of him who possesses the vision described in the previous verse, *undertakings,* the actions in which he engages himself, *are all devoid of desires* for results, *and plans:* i.e. purposes (saṁkalpas) which originate desires;—that is to say, he executes merely the movements of actions, without any selfish purpose in view—to serve as guidance to the world, in case he is following the pravṛtti mārga (the path of activity, i.e. wordly life), or for the bare sustenance of life, in case he has renounced worldly life; *and whose actions,* good and bad, *are burnt by the fire of Knowledge,* the vision of inaction in action and vice versa;—*him, (such an one), the sages,* the knowers of Brahman, *call Wise* in the true sense[20].

As for him who sees inaction and action (in their true light), he becomes freed from action by virtue of that very knowledge; renounces the world and betakes himself to no work, doing merely what is necessary for the sustenance of life—even though he had engaged himself in action before the dawn of knowledge. He acquires right Knowledge (of the Self), certainly does renounce work and its accessories, because he finds no use for activity. Even if, for some reason, he cannot renounce action and engages himself in action as before—(surely) without attachment to the action and its fruit, because he has no object to gain therefrom; and (merely) with a view to the guidance of the world—he really does nothing. To show that his activity gets transmuted as inaction, by reason of that activity having been burnt in the fire of Knowledge, the Lord proceeds:

त्यक्त्वा कर्मफलासङ्गं नित्यतृप्तो निराश्रयः ।
कर्मण्यभिप्रवृत्तोऽपि नैव किञ्चित्करोति सः ॥ २० ॥

20. This is to show the inapplicability of the appellation to those proficient in the (merely intellectual) Vaiśeṣika and other darśanas (systems of philosophy). (Ā)

Tyaktvā karma-phalāsaṁgam nityatṛpto nirāśrayaḥ
Karmaṇyabhipravṛtto(a)pi naiva kiñcitkaroti saḥ

20. Forsaking the clinging to fruits of action, ever satisfied, depending on nothing,—though engaged in action, he does not do anything.

Forsaking love of action and *the clinging to the fruits of action*, through the power of the Wisdom spoken of; *ever satisfied*, i.e. devoid of the desire for objects of the senses; *depending on nothing*, seeking no support (support is that, depending on which, one seeks to achieve an end in life); the meaning is: not depending on anything which is the means for attaining wished-for fruits, seen and unseen[21]............

As the wise man is possessed of the awareness of the actionless Self, the action performed by him is in reality non-action. By such a person, action with its accessories is simply to be renounced, because he has no use for it. Though this is the natural course of conduct, if it is not possible for him to get away from activity, on account of his wish to guide the world or to avoid the reproach of the virtuous,—such a person, *though engaged in action* as previously[22], *he does not do anything*, because he is possessed of the awareness of the action-less Self.

On the other hand, he who, unlike the person spoken of before[23], has realised his identity with Brahman, the innermost actionless Self abiding in all, even before engaging in any action; and who, by reason of having rid himself of all desire for seen and unseen objects of pleasure, finds no use in action aimed at securing them and renounces action with its accessories, merely doing what is necessary for maintaining the body;—such an ascetic, steadfast in devotion to Knowledge, is liberated. To teach this, the Lord says:

21. i.e. in this life or the next; or, here or in other worlds.

22. i.e. before the dawn of Knowledge. (Ā)

23. i.e. one disinterested in the welfare of the world etc. (Ā)

निराशीर्यतचित्तात्मा त्यक्तसर्वपरिग्रहः ।
शरीरं केवलं कर्म कुर्वन्नाप्नोति किल्बिषम् ॥ २१ ॥

Nirāśīr-yata-cittātma tyakta-sarva-parigrahaḥ
Śarrīam kevalam karma kurvan-nāpnoti kilbiṣam

21. Rid of desires, mind and body controlled, and all possessions relinquished, he, by performing mere bodily action, does not incur any evil.

Rid of desires, i.e. all desires have departed from him; *mind and body controlled,* the inner sense (antaḥ-karaṇa) and the external aggregate of causes and effects (i.e. the body and the external senses), have both been subdued by him; *and all possessions relinquished,* the totality of enjoyable objects have been abandoned by him; *he* (such a person), *by performing mere bodily action,* i.e. action needed for the bare maintenance of the body, and even that devoid of attachment, *does not incur any evil,* that which is undersirable, evil (pāpa), and virtue (dharma) as well, because even dharma is undesirable for one who seeks liberation (mokṣa), as it brings about bondage.

And now, what does the expression 'mere bodily action' mean?—Is it action to be performed by the body? or action needed for the maintenance of the body?

If it be asked, what is the use of such an enquiry as to whether 'bodily action' refers to action performed by the body or to action needed for the bare maintenance of the body, we reply:

If action performable by the body had been meant by 'bodily action', then by saying that one does not incur evil by performing action, productive of seen and unseen results, through the body—even if such action be a prohibited one—we shall be imputing (to the Lord) the teaching of something improper. And to say that by doing action, productive of seen and unseen results, prescribed by the Scripture one does not incur evil is to deny something which has not been propounded. And, because of the specification, "(by doing) bodily (action)" and the use of the word 'mere' ('*kevalam*') the implication would be that by performing

action by speech or thought—whether it be one prescribed by scripture or one prohibited by scripture, respectively known as dharma and adharma—one incurs evil. In that case also, to say that by doing (by speech or thought) a prescribed act, one incurs evil would be in contradiction (of scripture)[24]; and to say that by doing a prohibited act (by speech or thought) one incurs evil is a mere reiteration of a (known) truth and therefore useless.

If on the other hand 'bodily action' is taken to mean 'action needed for the bare maintenance of the body', then (the interpretation of the passage is as follows:)—by body, speech and mind, doing no other action—whether prescribed or prohibited by Scripture, and productive of seen and unseen results—and by body, speech and mind, performing in the eye of the world merely those movements of the body etc. which are needed for the bare maintenance of the body, without even the attachment 'I am doing (this)'—which is signified by the use of the word 'mere'—he does not incur evil. Because such a person is incapable of acquiring evil called sin, he does not fall into the evil of *saṁsāra;* he is surely liberated without any impediment, because all his actions have been consumed by the fire of Knowledge. This is merely a reiteration of the fruit of right Knowledge already described (IV.18). On this interpretation, the phrase 'mere bodily action' gives no room to objection.

For the ascetic who has relinquished all possessions, there is no question of owning food and other things[25] required for the maintenance of the body and it would follow that the maintenance of the body has to be done by begging or such other means. The Lord expounds the means of meeting with food and other things necessary for the mainteance of his body by the ascetic, as are authorised by scriptural texts such as: 'what is unsolicited, what is not previously arranged for, what comes to him by chance' (*Bodhāyana Dharma-Sūtra.* II.18.12)—

यदृच्छालाभसन्तुष्टो द्वन्द्वातीतो विमत्सरः ।
समः सिद्धावसिद्धौ च कृत्वापि न निबध्यते ॥ २२ ॥

24. Which prescribes *japa* (repetition of *mantra*) and *dhyāna* (meditation) for the saṁnyāsin. (Ā)

25. Footwear, clothing etc. (Ā)

Yadrcchā-lābha-santuṣṭo dvandvātīto vimatsaraḥ
Samah siddhāvasiddhau ca kṛtvāpi na nibadhyate

22. Content with what comes to him by chance, having transcended the pairs of opposites, free from envy, even-minded in success and failure, though acting he is not bound.

Content with what comes to him by chance, having the feeling of satiety by what comes to him unsolicited; *having transcended the pairs of opposites* such as cold and heat; *free from envy*, having no feeling of opposition; *even-minded in success and failure*, remaining the same whether chance favours or fails him........

He who is an ascetic of such a nature, feeling no joy or dejection and being the same whether he obtains or not the objects such as food required for maintaining the body, seeing inaction in action and vice versa, steady in the perception of the true nature of the Self, always reckoning when going through such acts as begging or doing anything else through the body etc. for the bare maintenance of the body, 'I am doing nothing (V-8) the guṇas act on the guṇas (III-28)' and thus realising the non-agency of the Self,—he really performs no act, not even the act of begging etc. However, since he appears to act according to the general way of the world, doership is imputed to him by the people of the world and (in that sense) he is (imagined as) the agent of the act of begging and the like. But in his own experience, founded on the authoritative teaching of Scripture, he is surely no agent.

He, such a person to whom others impute agency, *though acting*, performing such actions as begging, needed for the bare sustenance of the body, *is not bound*; because action and its cause, which are productive of bondage, have been consumed by the fire of Knowledge. This is only a reiteration of what has been stated already. (IV-19, 21).

In the verse, 'Forsaking the clinging to fruits of action' (IV-20), it has been shown that the person, who having started with action and who on the (subsequent) realisation of the identity of the actionless Self with Brahman sees for himself (the Self,) the

non-existence of agent, action, and results, and thereby has attained to the state of renouncing action, is however not able to do so through some reason and continues in that action as before, really does no action. In respect of such a person for whom absence of *karma* has thus been established, the Lord says—

गतसङ्गस्य मुक्तस्य ज्ञानावस्थित चेतसः ।
यज्ञायाचरतः कर्म समग्रं प्रविलीयते ॥ २३ ॥

Gata-saṁgasya muktasya jñānavasthita-cetasaḥ
Yajñayācarataḥ karma samagram pravilīyate

23. Devoid of attachment, liberated, with mind centred in Knowledge, performing work for *Yajña* alone, his whole *karma* dissolves away.

(For the person) *devoid of attachment* in all ways, *liberated*—i.e. all causes of bondage, dharma and adharma etc. have left him, *with mind centred in Knowledge* alone, *performing work for Yajña alone*[26], his whole karma, action with its result) 'agra'—end, i.e. fruit) *dissolves away*, is destroyed.

What is the reason for saying that all action performed by him dissolves away, without producing its natural result? The answer is: Because,

ब्रह्मार्पणं ब्रह्महविर्ब्रह्माग्नौ ब्रह्मणा हुतम् ।
ब्रह्मैव तेन गन्तव्यं ब्रह्म कर्म समाधिना ॥ २४ ॥

Brahmārpaṇam Brahma-havir-brahmāgnau
Brahmaṇā hutam
Brahmaiva tena gantavyam Brahma karma
samādhinā

26. For the sake of Yajña, the Lord Viṣṇu. (Ā). See also III-9.

24. The process is Brahman, the oblation is Brahman. In the fire of Brahman (the oblation is) offered by Brahman. By seeing Brahman in action, he reaches Brahman alone.

The process is Brahman—The process (or the sacrificial ladle, "arpaṇa") by which the knower of Brahman makes the offering in the fire, he sees that as Brahman alone, that it has no existence apart from (Brahman) the Self. Just as non-existence of silver is seen in the mother-of-pearl, so also the process (or the instrument by which the oblation is made) is (seen as) Brahman alone—just as what appears as silver is in reality mother-of-pearl alone. ('Brahma' and 'arpaṇam' are two separate words.) What is taken by the people of the world for the process or the instrument (ladle), is, for this knower of Brahman, Brahman alone—this is the meaning. So also,

The oblation is Brahman: that which is taken for oblation is to him only Brahman. ('Brahmāgnau' is a compound word.) *In the fire of Brahman the oblation is offered by Brahman:* the fire also, into which the oblation is offered, by the agent (Sacrificer) who is none other than Brahman, is Brahman only.

The act of offering which is performed by him is also Brahman.

He reaches Brahman alone—the goal to be attained by him is also Brahman, for the person *who sees Brahman in action*: action is Brahman; and he who rests his mind therein has to attain only to Brahman (as the goal).

Thus, action performed by such a person even with the desire to guide the world is in reality no action, for it has been destroyed by the consciousness of Brahman.

It thus becomes exceedingly appropriate to represent the Knowledge of even the saṁnyāsin who has retired from action and renounced all actions, as *yajña* (sacrifice), for the purpose of extolling that right knowledge (*samyag-darśana*). For this seer of the Truth, in the Knowledge-Sacrifice performed within himself (*adhyātmam*), Brahman alone is (stands for) the instrument for offering etc., the well-known factors in an ordinary sacrifice (*adhi-*

yajña). Otherwise, it will be meaningless to specify as Brahman only the instrument and the others (stated), when everything (in fact) is Brahman. Therefore, it is concluded that for the wise man, who realises that all this is Brahman alone, there is no action whatever. Also because the idea of accessories to action is wholly absent; and, there can indeed be no act of sacrifice in the absence of such an idea.

(To explain:) Every sacrificial rite such as the *agni-hotra* is associated with offering through words addressed to a specific deity and such other accessories, as also with the idea of doership and the expectation of the fruit on the part of the sacrificer; and is never seen dissociated from the various ideas of action, instrument and fruit, or devoid of the egoism of doership and expectation of the fruit. But this (Knowledge-Sacrifice) is an act in which the diverse ideas of accessories such as instrument, action and fruit have been destroyed by the comprehension of Brahman; and hence it is no-action verily. The same is shown in the verses, "He who can see inaction in action" (IV-18), "Though engaged in action, he does not do anything" (IV-20), "The guṇas act on the guṇas" (III-28), "The knower of Truth, centred (in the Self) should think, 'I do nothing at all'" (V-8), etc. Thus teaching here and there (every now and then), the Lord effaces the diverse ideas of action, accessories and result. Indeed, in the case of the *kāmya-agnihotra* (*agni-hotra* performed with the desire for the fruit) etc., it is admitted that by the destruction of the desire (for the fruit), the sacrifice itself ceases to be "*kāmya-agnihotra*". So also, different results are produced by actions, according as they are done intentionally or without any intention. Similarly, here also, the (apparent) action of the wise man, in whom ideas of duality such as accessories, action and fruit have been effaced by his consciousness of Brahman, and who merely executes the external movements of the body, ceases to be action. Hence it has been declared that "his whole karma dissolves away" (IV-23).

Some interpret this passage as follows:—What is Brahman, that is the instrument of action, etc.; in fact, Brahman alone (as they say) manifests Himself in the five forms[27] of accessories,

27. *Kartṛ*, *Karma*, *Karaṇa*, *Saṁpradāna* and *Adhikaraṇa*—the agent, the act done, the instrument or means by which done, for whom intended, and the location. (Ā)

such as the instrument (ladle), and does the action. Here, the idea of instrument etc. is not abolished, but the idea of Brahman is imparted to them, just as the idea of Viṣṇu or other deity is imparted to the idol, or the idea of Brahman is imparted to 'name' (*Ch.* VII-1-5). Even this view may be accepted as correct, if the topic under discussion were not the praise of Wisdom-Sacrifice (*Jñāna-yajña*). But the Lord here praises True Knowledge, designated Wisdom-Sacrifice, after expounding several acts of worship (yajña), in the words, "Knowledge-Sacrifice is superior to sacrifice (performed) with (material) objects" (IV-33). And here the words "The process (instrument) is Brahman" etc. appositely represent Knowledge as a sacrifice; otherwise, when everything is (in fact) Brahman, it would be meaningless to speak specifically of the process (instrument) etc. alone as Brahman. But, as for those who say that the idea of Brahman is to be imparted to the sacrificial accessories as the idea of Viṣṇu is imparted to an idol or as the idea of Brahman is imparted to 'name', the subject-matter of the verse cannot be the Brahman-Knowledge (*Brahma-Vidyā*) taught so far, because (according to them) the subject-matter to be understood would be the instrument of sacrifice etc. Moreover, the fruit of liberation (*mokṣa*) cannot be secured by a knowledge which brings the (mere) notion (of Brahman); but it is stated here that "He reaches Brahman alone", and it would indeed be improper to hold that the fruit of liberation can be secured by anything other than Perfect Knowledge. The interpretation is also incompatible with the context which treats of Right Knowledge, in the verse, "He who sees inaction in action" (IV-18) and in the summing up in the closing verses. The chapter, in fact, concludes by praising Right Knowledge in the words, "Knowledge-Sacrifice is superior to sacrifice (performed) with (material) objects" (IV-33), and "having attained Knowledge, he goes at once to the Supreme Peace" (IV-39). Therefore, it is improper to say, all of a sudden and severed from the context, that what is taught here is that the idea of Brahman should be imparted to the sacrificial accessories, as the idea of Viṣṇu is imparted to an idol. It is thus concluded that the meaning of the verse is as expounded by us.

Having represented Right Knowledge as a sacrifice, the Lord mentions other kinds of sacrifices as well, with a view to extolling that Right Knowledge—

दैवमेवापरे यज्ञं योगिनः पर्युपासते ।
ब्रह्माग्नावपरे यज्ञं यज्ञेनैवोपजुह्वति ॥ २५ ॥

Daivam-evāpare yajñam yoginah paryupāsate
Brahmāgnāvapare yajñam yajñenaivopajuhvati

25. Other yogins perform sacrifices to Devas only; while others offer the self as sacrifice by the Self Itself in the fire of Brahman.

Other yogins, those devoted to action (karma) *perform only sacrifices* in adoration *to Devas* (gods); while others, the knowers of Brahman, *offer the self as sacrifice by the Self Itself in the fire of Brahman.* By Brahman is denoted That which is described in the following texts—

" Brahman is the Real, Consciousness, the Infinite " (*Tai*-II-1);

" Brahman (is) Consciousness and Bliss " (*Br*. III.ix.28)

" Brahman, which is directly cognised by all and which is the Innermost Self of all " (*Br*.III.iv.1); and which is bereft of all attributes of mundane existence such as hunger, and is devoid of all characteristic marks as taught by Scripture, " It is not this; It is not this ". (*Br*.IV-iv-22).

That Brahman is (Itself) the fire here, the receptacle wherein the oblation is offered. The self (*ātman*) (here, the individual self),—one of whose synonyms is *yajña*—who in truth is none but the Supreme Brahman, but who associated with the limiting adjuncts such as the intellect (*buddhi*) and with all the attributes of the adjuncts superimposed on him constitutes the offering (*āhuti*), is offered in that fire of Brahman by the Self Itself, of the description given above[28]. To perceive the self limited by adjuncts in its true form as (identical with) the Supreme Brahman devoid of adjuncts is the sacrifice (offering the self) in the fire (of Brahman); and this (sacrifice) is performed by saṁnyāsins (those who have

28. i.e. bereft of all attributes such as hunger, and devoid of all characteristic marks. (Ā)

renounced all and are) devoted to the perception of the identity of the Self with Brahman. This sacrifice, of the form of Right Knowledge, is mentioned along with others such as the sacrifice to gods (Daiva-yajña) in the verses beginning with "The process is Brahman" (IV-24), for the purpose of extolling it in the words, "Knowledge-Sacrifice is superior to sacrifice (performed) with (material) objects" (IV-33).

श्रोत्रादीनीन्द्रियाण्यन्ये संयमाग्निषु जुह्वति ।
शब्दादीन्विषयानन्य इन्द्रियाग्निषु जुह्वति ॥ २६ ॥

Śrotrādīn-indriyāṇyanye saṁyamāgniṣu juhvati
Śabdādīn-viṣayānanya indriyāgniṣu juhvati

26. Others offer hearing and other senses as sacrifice in the fires of control; (while) others offer sound and other sense-objects as sacrifice in the fires of the senses.

Other yogins *offer hearing and other senses as sacrifice in the fires of control.* As there is separate control with respect to each sense, the plural ("fires") has been used. Controls (of the several senses) are themselves the fires. The meaning is that they are solely occupied in the control of their senses[29]. (While) *others offer sound and other sense-objects as sacrifice in the fires of the senses.* The senses are themselves the fires; and into them they offer the sacrifice (of sense-objects): they regard the grasping by the senses, such as hearing, of such sense-objects as are not prohibited by scripture[30], as sacrifice.

And—

सर्वाणीन्द्रियकर्माणि प्राणकर्माणि चापरे ।
आत्मसंयमयोगाग्नौ जुह्वति ज्ञानदीपिते ॥ २७ ॥

29. i.e. they withhold their external and internal organs of sense from sense-objects. (Ā)

30. i.e. they experience such sense-objects as may come to them, without relish or dislike, unlike the common run of mankind. (Ā)

Sarvāṇīndriya-karmāṇi prāṇa karmāṇi cāpare
Ātma-saṁyama-yogāgnau juhvati jñāna-dīpite

27. Others again offer all the actions of the senses and the functions of Prāṇa (the vital energy) as sacrifice in the *yoga*-fire of control in Self, kindled by Knowledge.

Others again offer all the actions of the senses and the functions of prāṇa (*the vital energy*)—Prāṇa is the vital air in the body, and its functions are contraction, expansion, etc.—*as sacrifice in the yoga-fire of control in Self:* concentration of the mind in the Self[31] is itself "yogāgni", the fire of yoga—*kindled by knowledge:* as a lamp is kindled by oil, this yoga-fire is made brilliant by discriminative knowledge; and in it they completely dissolve (the actions of the senses and of prāṇa).

द्रव्ययज्ञास्तपोयज्ञा योगयज्ञास्तथाऽपरे ।
स्वाध्याय-ज्ञानयज्ञाश्च यतयः संशितव्रताः ॥ २८ ॥

Dravya-yajñās-tapoyajña yoga-yajñas-tathā(a)pare
Svādhyaya-jñana-yajñaśca yatayaḥ saṁśita vratāḥ

28. Others again offer as sacrifice wealth, austerity, and *yoga*; while others, constant in endeavour and of rigid vows, offer the study of scriptures and knowledge as sacrifice.

Others again offer as sacrifice wealth: they are those who give away their wealth as sacrifice in holy places and to worthy persons; those that offer *austerity* as sacrifice are the ascetics (tapasvins); and some others offer as sacrifice *yoga,* comprising restraint of the vital air (prāṇāyāma), withdrawal of the mind from external objects (pratyāhāra), etc.[32]; *while others, constant in endeavour,* naturally

31. *ātma-saṁyama*. By *saṁyama* is denoted the triad of *dhāraṇā, dhyāna* and *samādhi* (fixed attention, meditation and absorption). These yogins restrain all activity and fix their mind in the contemplation of the Self. (Ā)

32. 'Etc.' refers to the remaining six limbs of *aṣṭāṅga-yoga*. (A)

disposed to persevere in their engagements, *and of rigid vows*, vows whetted and made strict, *offer as sacrifice the study of scriptures*, such as the Ṛg-Veda, according to the prescribed rules, *and knowledge*, through understanding of the scriptural precepts.

And—

अपाने जुह्वति प्राणं प्रणेऽपानं तथाऽपरे ।
प्राणापानगती रुद्ध्वा प्राणायामपरायणाः ॥ २९ ॥

Apāne juhvati prāṇam prāṇe(a)pānam tathā(a) pare
Prāṇāpāna gatī ruddhvā prāṇāyāma-parāyaṇāh

29. Yet some offer as sacrifice the outgoing breath into the incoming breath and the incoming into the outgoing, stopping the courses of the outgoing and the incoming breaths, constantly practising the regulation of the vital energy.

Yet some offer as sacrifice the outgoing into the incoming breath: i.e. they perform the kind of prānāyāma known as "Pūraka"; and the incoming into the outgoing: i.e. they also perform that kind of prāṇāyāma known as "Recaka"; *stopping the courses of the outgoing and the incoming breaths, constantly practising the regulation of the vital energy*[33]: i.e. they perform that kind of prāṇāyāma known as "Kumbhaka", by restraining the outgoing breath (prāṇa) from passing through the mouth and the nostrils, and the incoming breath (apāna) from passing in the contrary direction, namely downwards.

And again—

अपरे नियताहाराः प्राणान्प्राणेषु जुह्वति ।
सर्वेऽप्येते यज्ञविदो यज्ञक्षपितकल्मषाः ॥ ३० ॥

Apare niyatāhārāḥ prāṇān prāṇeṣu juhvati
Sarve(a)pyete yajñavido yajña-kṣapita-kalmaṣāh

33. Being solely devoted to *Prāṇāyāma*, they perform *Kumbhaka* after performing *Recaka* and *Pūraka*. (Ā)

30. Others, of regulated food, offer the life-breaths in the life-breaths. All of these are knowers of *yajña,* having their sins consumed by *yajñas.*

Others, of regulated food, whose food is limited in quantity, *offer life-breaths,* the several kinds of vital air, *in the life-breaths* themselves. Whatever prāṇa (vital air) has been controlled, into it they sacrifice all other prāṇas; these latter become, as it were, merged in the former.

All these are knowers of yajñas, having their sins consumed by (one or other of the) *yajñas,* stated above.

Thus performing (any of) the sacrifices stated above,

यज्ञशिष्टामृतभुजो यान्ति ब्रह्म सनातनम् ।
नायं लोकोऽस्त्ययज्ञस्य कुतोऽन्यः कुरुसत्तम ॥ ३१ ॥

Yajña-śiṣṭāmṛta-bhujo yānti Brahma sanātanam
Nāyam loko(a)styayajñasya kuto(a)nyaḥ Kuru-sattama

31. Eating of the nectar, the remnant of yajña, they go to the Eternal Brahman. (Even) this world (i.e. good things of the world) is not for the non-performer of yajña; how then the other, O best of Kurus?

Eating of the nectar, which is *the remnant of yajña,*—i.e. having performed the sacrifices mentioned above, they eat the remnants of the prescribed food, at intervals, in the prescribed manner. The food so eaten is called nectar ('amṛta'—immortal); and eating it *they go to the Eternal Brahman*: If they are desirous of liberation (mumukṣus), (they go to Brahman) in course of time[34]; and this has to be understood from the significance (of the word 'go' which implies proceeding step by step).

34. i.e. after attaining Knowledge through purification of the heart (*citta-śuddhi*). The process of *krama-mukti* is here referred to. (Ā) See Com. on V.26 (and footnote 22 there) for the difference between *krama mukti* and *sadyo-mukti.*

(*Even*) *the good things of this world,* though universal for all living beings, *are not for the non-performer of yajña,* he who does not perform even one of the (several) sacrifices mentioned[35]. *How then the other*[36], which has to be attained through particular superior means, *O best of Kurus?*

एवं बहुविधा यज्ञा वितता ब्रह्मणो मुखे ॥
कर्मजान्विद्धि तान्सर्वानेवं ज्ञात्वा विमोक्ष्यसे ॥ ३२ ॥

Evam bahu vidhā yajña vitatā Brahmaṇo mukhe
Karmajān-viddhi tān-sarvān-evam jñātvā vimokṣyase

32. Various *Yajñas*, like the above, are strewn in the mouth (storehouse) of the Veda. Know them all to be born of action; and thus knowing, you shall be free (liberated).

Various, manifold, *yajñas, like the above, are strewn in the mouth* (*store-house*) *of the Veda*: i.e. they are known from the Vedas, as from the text, " We sacrifice prāṇa in speech " (*Ai.Ār.* III-2-6). *Know them all to be born of action*, through body, speech and mind, and not as born from the Self, for the Self is verily actionless. *And,* therefore, *knowing thus, you shall be free* (*liberated*) from evil. The meaning is—knowing that " these are not my actions; I am actionless and unconcerned ", you will be freed through such right knowledge, from the bondage of saṁsāra.

By the verse beginning " The process is Brahman " (IV-24), Right Knowledge has been represented as sacrifice Thereafter, several sacrifices have also been taught; compared with these that lead to the attainment of the objects of human endeavour, knowledge is now being extolled. How?

35. That a man who does not perform any of the yajñas becomes sinful (and therefore, is denied the good things of even worldly life) is here pointed out. (Ā). Life in this world will not be happy for him; and on death he may not be reborn in this world (as a human being or otherwise) and may have to go to hell; he will certainly neither go to heaven, nor attain *mokṣa.*

36. " The other " means that which is other than worldly, i.e., the spiritual.

श्रेयान्द्रव्यमयाद्यज्ञाज्ज्ञानयज्ञः परन्तप ।
सर्वं कर्माखिलं पार्थ ज्ञाने परिसमाप्यते ॥ ३३ ॥

Śreyān-dravyamayād-yajñāj-jñānayajñah parantapa
Sarvam karmākhilam Pārtha jñāne parisamāpyate

33. Knowledge-sacrifice, O scorcher of foes, is superior to sacrifice with objects. All action in its entirety, O Pārtha, attains its consummation in Knowledge.

Knowledge-sacrifice, O scorcher of foes, is superior to sacrifice with objects, that which has to be performed by means of material objects. Whereas sacrifice with material objects is sure to produce results, Wisdom-Sacrifice does not produce any result; therefore it is superior, more commendable. How? Because, *all action in its entirety,* undisputedly, *O Pārtha, attains its consummation,* is comprehended, *in Knowledge,* which is the (sole) means to liberation (mokṣa) and which stands in the position of the all-spreading flood (II-46). So says the Śruti: " As in the game of dice, by winning the ' four ' called " kṛta ", the (three) inferior are collected (won); exactly so, whatever good (acts) people do, all that reaches him. Any (other) man who knows what he (Raikva) knew (obtains the same result) " (*Ch.*IV-i-4).

By what means, then, is this pre-eminent Knowledge to be obtained? That is stated:

तद्विद्धि प्रणिपातेन परिप्रश्नेन सेवया ।
उपदेक्ष्यन्ति ते ज्ञानं ज्ञानिनस्तत्त्वदर्शिनः ॥ ३४ ॥

Tad-viddhi praṇipātena paripraśnena sevayā
Upadekṣyanti te jñānam jñāninas-tattva-darśinaḥ

34. Know that by prostrating yourself, by questions, and by service, the wise, those who have realised the Truth, will instruct you in that knowledge.

Know that, the process by which it is obtained:—approaching the Ācāryas (teachers), *by prostrating yourself,* falling exceedingly low in a long prostration, *by questions*: " What is the cause of bondage? What is the means of liberation? , What is knowledge?, What is nescience (avidyā)? " ; *and by service,* attendance on the Guru (i.e. Ācaryā). Pleased with these and other acts of utmost respectfulness, the teachers, *the wise, those who* know the Truth and *have* also *realised the Truth, will instruct you in,* communicate to you, that knowledge which has been described. Though knowing the Truth, only some realise the Truth as It is, while others do not; hence the attribute, " who have realised the Truth ". The Lord is thus of the opinion that only the knowledge imparted by those who have realised the perfect Truth is capable of bringing about results, and nothing else will.

Since it is so, the following statement is also apposite:

यज्ज्ञात्वा न पुनर्मोहमेवं यास्यसि पाण्डव ।
येन भूतान्यशेषेण द्रक्ष्यस्यात्मन्यथो मयि ॥ ३५ ॥

Yajjñātva na punar moham evam yāsyasi Pāṇḍava
Yena bhūtānyaśeṣeṇa drakṣyasyātmanyatho mayi

35. Knowing which, you shall not, O Pāṇḍava, again get deluded like this, and by which you shall see the whole of creation in (your) Self and in Me.

Knowing which, i.e. obtaining the Knowledge communicated by them, *you shall not, O Pāṇḍava, again get deluded like this,* in the manner you are confounded at present; *and,* moreover, by which Knowledge *you shall* directly *see the whole of creation* from Brahmā (the Creator) down to the blade of grass *in (your) Self,* realising that " all these beings exist in me ", *and* also that all these exist *in Me,* Vāsudeva, the supreme Lord. The meaning is: you will see the identity of the individual soul (kṣetrajña) and Īśvara, which is celebrated in all the Upaniṣads.

(Hear) also the greatness of this knowledge—

अपि चेदसि पापेभ्यः सर्वेभ्यः पापकृत्तमः ।
सर्वं ज्ञानप्लवेनैव वृजिनं सन्तरिष्यसि ॥ ३६ ॥

Api cedasi papebhyaḥ sarvebhyaḥ pāpa kṛttamaḥ
Sarvam jñāna plavenaiva vṛjinam santariṣyasi

36. Even if you be the most sinful among all the sinful, yet by the raft of Knowledge alone you shall go across all sin.

Even if you are the most sinful, sinful to the extreme degree, *among all the sinful,* those who commit sin, *yet by the raft of Knowledge alone,* making use of Knowledge alone as the raft, *you shall go across* the ocean comprising *all sin.* Here[37], even dharma (virtue, righteousness) is declared as sin for one who seeks liberation.

How Knowledge destroys sin is being stated, with an illustration:

यथैधांसि समिद्धोऽग्निर्भस्मसात्कुरुतेऽर्जुन ।
ज्ञानाग्निः सर्वकर्माणि भस्मसात्कुरुते तथा ॥ ३७ ॥

Yathaidhāmsi samiddho(a)gnir-bhasmasāt
kurute(a)rjuna
Jñānagniḥ sarvakārmaṇi bhasmasāt kurute tathā

37. As blazing fire reduces wood to ashes, so, O Arjuna, does the fire of Knowledge reduce all *karma* to ashes.

As blazing, well-kindled, *fire reduces* logs of *wood to ashes, O Arjuna, so does the fire of Knowledge*—Knowledge itself is fire—*reduce all karma to ashes,* i.e., renders it seedless (unproductive).

37. 'Here' refers to the science of the Self (*adhyātma-sastra*). This explanation is to remove the possible doubt that even after adharma has vanished, dharma may act as an impediment to the man of wisdom attaining *mokṣa.* (Ā)

The fire of Knowledge cannot, indeed, directly reduce action to ashes as fire does fuel; therefore, it should be understood that Right Knowledge is the means to render all actions impotent. By virtue of its force, the karma[38] by which the body has been produced will terminate only after being enjoyed; for, it has already commenced to bear fruit. Hence, Knowledge destroys only all those actions, whether done before the dawn of Knowledge or following Knowledge or done in the several previous births, which have not begun to bear fruit.

Wherefore,

न हि ज्ञानेन सदृशं पवित्रमिह विद्यते ।
तत्स्वयं योगसंसिद्धः कालेनात्मनि विन्दति ॥ ३८ ॥

Na hi jñānena sadṛsam pavitram iha vidyate
Tat svayam yoga samsiddhaḥ kālenātmani vindati

38. Verily, there exists in this world no purifier like Knowledge. Having reached perfection in *yoga,* one realises that (Knowledge) in time, in himself by himself.

Verily, there exists in this world no purifier, that which sanctifies and expiates, *like Knowledge. Having reached perfection in yoga,* perfecting and attaining competence through yoga,—by Karma-yoga and Sāmadhi-yoga, *one,* i.e. he who aspires for liberation, *realises that*, gets that *Knowledge, in time*, i.e. after a long time, *in himself by himself* alone.

The means by which attainment of Knowledge is absolutely secured is now taught:

श्रद्धावाँल्लभते ज्ञानं तत्परः सम्यतेन्द्रियः ।
ज्ञानं लब्ध्वा परां शान्तिमचिरेणाधिगच्छति ॥ ३९ ॥

38. *Prārabdha karma.*

Śraddhāvān-labhate jñānam tatparaḥ
saṁyatendriyaḥ
Jñānam labdhvā parām śāntim-acireṇādhigacchati

39. The man with śraddhā, devoted to it (Knowledge) and master of his senses, attains (this) Knowledge. Having attained Knowledge, he goes without delay to the Supreme Peace.

The man with sraddha[39], he who is full of faith, *attains* (this) *Knowledge*. Though one may have faith, he may be slow in proceeding (towards the desired object); and so it is added: *devoted to it,* intently engaged in the means of obtaining Knowledge, namely, attendance on the Teacher (Guru), etc.[40] Though having faith and devotion, one may not have control over his senses; hence it is stated: *master of his senses*, i.e. one whose senses have been withdrawn from their objects. Such a man of faith, devotion and mastery over the senses surely attains Knowledge.

Prostration and other external acts (IV-34) may not be infallible, because of the possibility of deceitfulness etc.; but there can be no such possibility when there is faith etc. Hence these are the infallible means for acquiring Knowledge.

What now, is the result of the acquisition of Knowledge? The answer is : *Having attained knowledge, he goes without delay*, at once, *to the Suprecme Peace* alled liberation (mokṣa). That liberation is immediately secured through Right Knowledge is the well-established truth, proclaimed by all śāstras and by reason.

There should be no doubt about this: for doubt is extremely sinful. How? The reply is:

अज्ञश्चाश्रद्दधानश्च संशयात्मा विनश्यति ।
नायं लोकोऽस्ति न परो न सुखं संशयात्मनः ॥ ४० ॥

39. Faith in the words of the Guru and in the Scripture. (*Viveka-Cūdamaṇi*, 26).

40. 'Listening' to the teachings (*śravana*) etc. are meant. (Ā) The 'etc.' consists of *manana*, reflection over the teachings and *nididhyāsa*, the realisation of their truth by constant musing.

Ajñaścāśraddadhānaśca saṁśayātma vinaśyati
Nāyam loko(a)sti na paro na sukham
saṁśayātmanaḥ

40. The ignorant, the man without faith, the doubting person, (everyone of these) goes to destruction; (and) for the doubting person, there is neither this world, nor the next, norhappiness.

The ignorant, he who does not know the Self, as also *the man without faith*, and also *the doubting person* (everyone of these) *goes to destruction.* Though the ignorant and the faithless go to ruin, they are not ruined to the extent the doubter is. He is the most sinful of all. How? *For the doubting person,* the man with a sceptical mind (atma=chitta=mind), *there is neither this world,* which is universal for all, *nor the next* world, *nor happiness,* because he will have doubts even about all these. Therefore, doubt should not be entertained.

Wherefore?

योगसंन्यस्तकर्माणं ज्ञानसंछिन्न संशयम् ।
आत्मवन्तं न कर्माणि निवध्नन्ति धनञ्जय ॥ ४१ ॥

Yoga-saṁnyasta-karmāṇam jñāna-sañcchinna-
saṁśayam
Ātmavantam na karmāṇi nibadhananti Dhañanjaya

41. With work renounced by *yoga* and doubts rent asunder by Knowledge, O Dhanañjaya, actions do not bind him who is poised in the Self.

With work renounced by yoga: By yoga which consists in the realisation of the supreme Truth, all actions—dharma and adharma—are renounced by him who sees the supreme Truth. How is he able to do so? Because his *doubts* have been *rent asunder by Knowledge,* the realisation of the identity of the Self with Īśvara. He, who has thus renounced work by yoga, *is poised*

in the Self, is never swerving from his Self. *Him, actions*, which he sees (merely) as the movements of the guṇas, *do not bind*, do not bring about any returns, bad or others[41], *O Dhanañjaya*!

Because he who, by practising *karma-yoga* gets his impurities destroyed and thereby obtains Knowledge, and then, having all his doubts rent asunder by that Knowledge, is not bound by actions—just because all his actions have been burnt in the fire of Knowledge; and because also he who entertains doubts regarding Knowledge (jñāna) and the performance of action (karmānuṣṭhanā)[42] gets ruined—

तस्मादज्ञान संभूतं हृत्स्थं ज्ञानासिनाऽऽत्मनः ।
छित्त्वैनं संशयं योगमातिष्ठोत्तिष्ठ भारत ॥ ४२ ॥

Tasmād-ajñāna-sambhūtam hṛtstham jñānāsinā (ā)tmanaḥ
Chitvainam saṃśayam yogam-ātiṣṭhottiṣṭha Bhārata

42. Therefore, cutting with the sword of Knowledge, this doubt about the Self, born of ignorance and dwelling in (your) heart, take refuge in *yoga*. Arise, O Bharata!

Therefore, cutting with the sword of Knowledge—Right Knowledge (about the Self) is itself the sword; and it destroys all evil such as sorrow and delusion. With that sword, cut *this doubt*, which is most sinful, which is *born of ignorance*, non-discrimination, *dwelling in your heart*, i.e. in the buddhi (intellect), *about the Self*, your own (Self): since the subject-matter of the doubt is the Self (the word (ātmanaḥ'' has been so interpreted). It is indeed not in order that a doubt entertained by any person needs another to cut it off (repel it)[43], in which case the word (ātmanaḥ') may

41. Desirable results and mixed results. (Ā) vide XVIII.12.

42. As conductive to Knowledge. (Ā)

43. Any doubt entertained by a person can only be cut off (repelled) by (correct) knowledge arising in that very person; for example, a doubt about a pillar entertained by Devadatta can be repelled only by (true) knowledge (of the object) arising in himself. (Ā)

be taken as an adjective meaning 'your' (qualifying 'doubt'). Therefore the interpretation that the doubt concerns the Self; even so (the implication is that) it is one entertained by (Arjuna) himself.

Cutting this doubt, which will bring about your ruin, *take refuge in yoga*, take to the practice of Karma-yoga, which is the means to the acquisition of Right Knowledge. And now, *arise*, to fight, *O Bhārata*!

इति श्रीमहाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयसिक्यां
भीष्मपर्वणि श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु ब्रह्मविद्यायां
योगशास्त्रे श्रीकृष्णार्जुनसंवादे ज्ञान-कर्म-
संन्यासयोगो नाम
चतुर्थोऽध्यायः ॥

Iti Śrī-Mahābhārate śata sāhasryām saṁhitāyām Vaiyāsikyām Bhīṣma-Parvaṇi Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītāsūpaniṣatsu Brahma-vidhyāyām yogaśāstre Śrī Kṛṣṇārjuna-Saṁvāde jñāna-karma-saṁnyāsa-yogo nāma caturtho(a)dhyāyaḥ

Thus the fourth chapter entitled 'Way of Renunciation of Action In Knowledge'[44] in the Upaniṣads known as 'The Celebrated Songs of the Lord' expounding the Knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna—embodied in the Bhīṣma Parva of Śrī Mahābhārata, the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyāsa.

44. The name given to this Chapter in the Bhāṣya is *Brahma-Yajña-praśamsā*, 'The Praise of Brahman-Sacrifice'.

॥ पञ्चमोऽध्यायः ॥

(कर्मसंन्यास योगः)

PANCAMO(A)DHYAYAḤ

(*KARMASAṀNYASA YOGAḤ*)

CHAPTER - V

(WAY OF RENUNCIATION OF ACTION)

In the passages commencing from "He who can see inaction in action" (IV-18), "He is a yogi and a doer of all action" (IV-18), "Whose actions are burnt by the fire of Knowledge" (IV-19), "By performing mere bodily action" (IV-21), "content with what comes to him by chance" (IV-22), "The process is Brahman, the oblation is Brahman" (IV-24), "Know them all to be born of action" (IV-32), "All action in its entirety, O Partha!" (IV-33), "The fire of Knowledge (reduces) all *karma* (to ashes)" (IV-37), and ending with, "With work renounced by *yoga*" (IV-41), the Lord has taught the renunciation of all action. And in the passage, "cutting...........this doubt........... take refuge in *yoga*" (IV-42), He has advised Arjuna to devote himself to *yoga*, consisting in the performance of action. These two—performance of action and renunciation of action—being opposed to each other, like moving and remaining stationary, are impossible of execution by one (and the same person) simultaneously; and the performance at different times (by the same person) has not also been prescribed. It accordingly follows that only one of these two is to be engaged in. Therefore, thinking that the more commendable of the two—performance of action, or renunciation thereof—should be engaged in, and not the other, and (consequently) eager to learn that which is the more commendable, Arjuna enquired (the Lord), "Renunciation of actions, O Kṛṣṇa, etc." (V-1) (which is the commencement of the present Chapter).

Objection—Is it not that, in the passages quoted above, the Lord has taught renunciation of all action, with the intention of

establishing devotion to jñāna-yoga as the duty of him who has known (the truth about) the Self, and not of him who has not known the Self? Therefore, inasmuch as performance of action and renunciation there of relate to different classes of persons, the question aimed at learning what is the more commendable of the two is irrelevant.

Reply—True : from the point of view set out by you, the question is irrelevant. But, we say that it is quite relevant from the point of view of the questioner himself.

Objection—How?

Reply—Since, in the passages quoted above, renunciation of action is taught by the Lord as a duty to be engaged in, it is more important (than the agent), and without an agent it cannot become an object to be accomplished; therefore, the injunction (to renounce action) covers even the person who has not known the Self and who can be the agent (of the act of renunciation) from this standpoint. And, moreover, renunciation of action has not been prescribed as fit to be undertaken only by persons who have known the Self[1]. Arjuna, thus thinks that there is competence for the person who has not known the Self, both with regard to the performance of action as well as to the renunciation thereof; and, because of their mutual opposition in the manner already stated, it being evident that only one of them—that one which is more commendable, and not the other—should be engaged

1. The argument here is based on the principles of (*Pūrva* or *Karma*) *Mīmāmsā*, The Mīmāṃsakas hold that a single proposition can embody only a single injunction; otherwise there would be the fallacy of a double precept in a single proposition (*vākya-bheda*). An injunction such as, " One desirous of heaven should sacrifice", prescribes sacrifice for the person desiring heaven; but it does not authorise only him, to the exclusion of others, to perform it. So also, the injunction about renunciation should be extended so as to apply to that person also who has not known the Self; and it cannot be restricted as applying to the knower of the Self alone. Renunciation is (elsewhere) enjoined even on the man who has not known the Self, when he is full of *vairāgya* (indifference to worldly concerns). Therefore, there can be competence on the part of the man who has not known the Self, both as to performance of action as well as renunciation of action; and hence Arjuna's question is proper. (Ānandagiri's gloss elaborated).

in, his question aimed at learning the more commendable course is not irrelevant. That the view of the questioner is as stated above can be arrived at by an investigation of the import of the (Lord's) reply as well.

Objection—How?

Reply—The (Lord's) reply is: "Both renunciation and performance of action lead to freedom; of these, performance of action is superior". (V.2). The point for investigation here is:—Is it with reference to the renunciation and the performance of action, engaged in by one who has known the Self, that they are both stated as the means to freedom, but that on account of some special peculiarity, the performance of action is said to be superior to renunciation of action? Or, is it with reference to the renunciation and the performance of action, engaged in by one who has not known the Self, that the two statements are made?

Objection—What then[2]?—Whether it is with reference to the reunciation and the performance of action, engaged in by the knower of the Self, that they are said to lead to freedom, but that, of the two, performance of action is superior to renunciation of action; or whether it is with reference to the renunciation and performance of action, engaged in by one who has not known the Self, that the two statements are made?

Reply—As to this, we state: Since it is impossible that renunciation and performance of action will be engaged in by a person who has known the Self, it is illogical alike to speak of their leading to freedom, or to speak of his *karma-yoga* as being superior to his renunciation of action. If (on the other hand) renunciation of action and its opposite—*karma-yoga*, performance of action,—be possible for the man who has not known the Self, then it would be proper alike to speak of them as leading to freedom and to speak of *karma-yoga* as superior to renunciation of action. But, in the case of the person who has known the Self, insamuch as renunciation and *karma-yoga* are incompatible, to say that they

2. What is the objection to the former alternative? And, what is the advantage in the latter? (Ā)

both lead to freedom and that *karma-yoga* is superior to renunciation is not proper.

Question—Are renunciation and *karma-yoga* alike impossible for the man who has nown the Self; or is only one of them impossible—and, in that case, is it *karma-saṁnyāsa* (renunciation of Karma) or *karma-yoga*? And, what is the reason for such impossibility?

Reply—As misapprehension (*mithyā-jñāna*) has been effaced for the man who has known the Self, *karma-yoga* which rests on erroneous knowledge will not be possible for him. In this very *Gitā-Śāstra*, here and there in the sections dealing with the exposition of the true nature of the Self, it is established that the person who has realised the Self—who knows himself as the Self, devoid of all modification such as birth etc., and actionless,—and in whom erroneous knowledge has been dispelled by true Knowledge, has to totally renounce all action by abidance in his true form as the action-less Self; and it is also expounded that, because of the antithesis between true Knowledge and wrong knowledge and between their results, there is no possibility for him to take to *karma-yoga*—which is its (renunciation's) opposite, which is preceded by attachment to the idea of doership born of wrong knowledge, and which depends on a 'self' of an active nature. Wherefore, it is rightly said that for the man, who has known the Self and whose wrong knowledge has been effaced, there is no possibility of *karma-yoga* which is based on erroneous knowledge.

Question—What then are the sections, dealing with the exposition of the true nature of the Self, wherein the impossibility of action for the man who has known the Self has been established?

Reply—In the section beginning, "Know for certain That... to be indestructible" (II-17), and (continuing) "He who takes the Self to be the slayer" (II:-19), "The man who knows This to be indestructible, eternal" (II-21), and in other sections here and there, ithe impossibility of action for the man of realisation has been spoken of.

Objection—Has not *karma-yoga* also been declared here and there in the sections dealing with the exposition of the nature

of the Self?—as, for instance, in "Fight, therefore, O descendant of Bharata!" 'II-18), "Having regard to your own dharma also" (II-31), "Your right is to work alone" (II-47)' etc.? And so, how could *karma-yoga* be impossible for the man of realisation?

Reply—Because of the antithesis between true Knowledge and wrong knowledge and between their effects. In the words, "By *jnana-yoga* for the Sāṁkhyas" (III-3), devotion to the path of *jñāna-yoga*, characterised by abidance in the actionless Self, to be practised by those who know the true nature of the Self, the Sāṁkhyas, is distinguished from devotion to the path of *karma-yoga* which is to be practised by those who have not known the Self. Because the knower of the Self has accomplished his object (i.e. fulfilled himself; achieved all), he has no need for anything else. And he has no more duty to perform, as has been said : "For him, there is nothing to do" (III-17). In the passage such as, "By non-performance of works........." (III-4), "But renunciation of action, O mighty-armed........." (V-6), *karma-yoga* is laid down as an accessory to Self-knowledge; while in the passage, "For him (the *muni*), when he has attained to *yoga*, inaction (*sama*) is said to be the means" (VI-3), it is stated that, on obtaining Right Knowledge, he has no (further) need for *karma-yoga*. Moreover, action other than that necessary for the sustenance of the body is precluded in the passage, "By performing mere bodily action, he does not incur any evil" (IV-21); and, even with regard to actions such as seeing and hearing engaged in connection with the bare sustenance of the body, it is advised, in the passage," The knower of Truth, (being) centred (in the Self)- should think 'I do nothing at all," (V-8), that the person who knows the true nature of the Self should, through composure of mind, never entertain the idea that he is doing (those actions). Wherefore it is impossible even to dream of associating *karma-yoga*—which is incompatible with Right Knowledge and is based of false knowledge—with the man who knows the real nature of the Self. Therefore, it is only the renunciation and the *karma yoga* engaged in by the person who has not known the Self that are (here) spoken of as leading to freedom. This renunciation of action is different from the *total* renunciation of action previously referred to, which is resorted to by the knower of the Self, since its scope is restricted to (the renunciation of) some action only,

the idea of doership still continuing[3]. And, because this renunciation being associated with '*yama*', '*niyama*', etc., is difficult to practise, while *karma-yoga* is easier of performance, the latter is said to be the superior. Thus, even by investigation of the meaning of the words in the (Lord's) reply, it is concluded that the view of the questioner is the same as originally stated.

In the verse, "If it be considered by Thee that Knowledge is superior to action" (III-1), Arjuna requested (the Lord) to tell him the better of the two—since both Knowledge and action cannot co-exist in one and the same person; and the Lord settled the matter by stating that devotion to *jñāna-yoga* was meant for the Sāṁkhyas, namely the saṁnyāsins, and that devotion to *karma-yoga* was intended for the (karma-)yogins. And, by the statement, "Neither by mere renunciation does man attain to perfection" (III-4), He experessed Himself in favour of renunciation accompanied by Knowledge as the means of attaining perfection. *Karma-yoga* also has been enjoined (IV-42) as a means. Arjuna now enquires, with a view to knowing which of the two is superior—renunciation without Knowledge, or *Karma-yoga*—and the difference between them.[4]

अर्जुन उवाच—

संन्यासं कर्मणां कृष्ण पुनर्योगं च शंससि ।

यच्छ्रेय एतयोरेकं तन्मे ब्रूहि सुनिश्चितम् ॥ १ ॥

3. A person who has not yet realised the Self and betakes himself to the fourth religious order of *saṁnyāsa* still retains the idea of doership with reference to 'hearing' (*śravaṇa*) and the like, prescribed for his order. He has only renounced the actions prescribed for his previous order and hence his renunciation is only partial. He has also to apply himself to the observance of *yama*, (various forms of abstentions from evil-doing) *niyama* (observances for the effective practice of virtues), etc. prescribed for his order. (Ā)

4. Arjuna's enquiry cannot relate to a comparison between *Sāṁkhya* (*Jñāna-yoga*) and *karma-yoga*, since the Lord had declared both as leading to perfection (*siddhi*). His question must be only for knowing whether (*in his case*) karma-yoga is more commendable as compared with renunciation of action. (Ā)

Arjuna uvāca—

Saṁnyāsam karmaṇām Kṛṣṇa punar-yogam ca śaṁsasi
Yacchreya etayore-ekam tan-me brūhi suniścitam

Arjuna said—

1. Renunciation of actions, O Kṛṣṇa, Thou commandest, and again (*karmayoga*). Do Thou tell me decisively that one which is the better of these two.

Renunciation of actions, prescribed in the scriptures (śāstras), to be performed variously, *O Kṛṣṇa, Thou commandest*, i.e. teachest; *and again karma-yoga*: Thou teachest that it is necessary to perform those very actions. Consequently, I feel a doubt as to which of them is better: whether the performance of action is better or its abandonment; and, since the better course must be followed,—*which is the better*, the more commendable, *of these two*, renunciation of action and performance of action,—that by which you think I may attain felicity, *that one*—because both of them cannot be practised together by the same person, *do Thou tell me decisively*, as having Thy approval.

Giving His opinion, for settling the doubt—

श्री भगवानुवाच—
संन्यासः कर्मयोगश्च निःश्रेयसकरावुभौ ।
तयोस्तु कर्मसंन्यासात्कर्मयोगो विशिष्यते ॥ २ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Saṁnyāsaḥ karma-yogaśca niḥśreyasakarāvubham
Tayostu-karma-saṁnyāsāt-karma-yoga viśiṣyate

The Blessed Lord said—

2. Both renunciation and performance of action lead to freedom: of these, performance of action is superior to the renunciation of action.

Both renunciation of actions, *and performance of actions,* as well, *lead to freedom,* mokṣa. Though both of them lead to freedom by bringing about the dawn of Knowledge,—*of these* means of attaining freedom, *performance of action is superior to the* mere *renunciation of action*[5]; thus the Lord extols Karma-yoga.

Wherefore? The answer is:

ज्ञेयः स नित्यसंन्यासी यो न द्वेष्टि न काङ्क्षति ।
निर्द्वन्द्वो हि महाबाहो सुखं बन्धात्प्रमुच्यते ॥ ३ ॥

Jñeyaḥ sa nitya-saṁnyāsi yo na dveṣṭi na kāṅkiṣati
Nirdvandvo hi mahābāho sukham bandhāt-pramucyate

3. He should be known a constant saṁnyāsin, who neither likes nor dislikes: for, free from the pairs of opposites, O mighty-armed, he is easily set free from bondage.

He, the Karma-yogi, *should be known* to be *a constant saṁnyāsin, who neither dislikes* anything *nor likes* anything. The meaning is that he who neither dislikes pain and the objects which cause pain, nor desires pleasure and the objects which cause it, should be known as a constant saṁnyāsin (renouncer), even though he is engaged in action. *For, free from the pairs of opposites. O mighty-armed, he is easily,* without difficulty, *set free from bondage.*

Saṁnyāsa and *karma-yoga,* being prescribed for practice by different classes of persons, are mutually opposed; and it stands to reason that they should produce different results, instead of both leading to freedom alike. As to this doubt, the Lord says—

5. i.e. unaccompanied by Knowledge. The *Karma-saṁnyāsa* (renunciation of actions) which follows (i.e. comes after the dawn of) Knowledge is superior to *karma-yoga,* and this meaning is intended by the qualifying word 'mere'. (Ā)

सांख्य-योगौ पृथग्बालाः प्रवदन्ति न पण्डिताः ।
एकमप्यास्थितः सम्यगुभयोर्विन्दते फलम् ॥ ४ ॥

Sāṁkhya-yoga pṛthag-bālāḥ pravadanti na Paṇḍitāḥ
Ekam-apyāsthitaḥ sāṁyag-ubhayor-vindate phalam

4. Children (i.e., the ignorant ones), not the wise, speak of *Sāṁkhya* and *Yoga* (i.e. *karma-yoga*) as dinstinct. He who has truly betaken himself to even one (of them) gains the fruit of both.

Children (i.e., the ignorant ones) *speak of Sāṁkhya and Yoga as distinct*, productive of different and contrary results; *not the wise*: the wise, on the other hand, believe that they produce not different, but the same, result. How? *He, who has truly betaken himself to*, i.e. properly practised, *eved one* (of them), Sāṁkhya or Yoga, *gains the fruit of both*. The fruit of both is verily the self-same freedom; hence, there is nothing contrary in the result.

Objection—Having commenced the topic with the words '*Saṁnyāsa*' and '*karma-yoga*', how does the Lord speak here of '*Sāṁkhya*' and 'Yoga'—unconnected with the topic—as leading to the same result?

Reply—There is nothing wrong here. Even though Arjuna put his question having in mind mere *saṁnyāsa* and mere *karma-yoga*, the Lord, without discarding them, has associated with them some special ideas of his own and given his reply (by referring to them, respectively) in different words as *Sāṁkhya* and *Yoga*. In the Lord's view, the two—*Saṁnyāsa* with Knowledge and *karma-yoga* accompanied with equanimity (*sam-buddhitva*) etc. which are the means to knowledge—are themselves expressible by the terms *Sāṁkhya* and *Yoga*[6]; and thus there is no digression on an irrelevant topic.

6. *Sāṁkhya*: *Saṁnyāsa* with Knowledge. Yoga: *karma-yoga* accompanied by equanimity.

By properly practising even one (of the two), how does a man gain the fruits of both? The reply is—

यत्सांख्यैः प्राप्यते स्थानं तद्योगैरपि गम्यते ।
एकं सांख्यं च योगं च यः पश्यति स पश्यति ॥ ५ ॥

Yat-sāṁkhyaiḥ prāpyate sthānam tad-yogair-api gamyate
Ekam sāṁkhyam ca yogam ca yaḥ paśyati sa paśyati

5. The state which is reached by the Ṣāṁkyas is also reached by the Yogins. Who sees *Sāṁkhya* and *Yoga* as on,e he sees (understands aright).

Tye state, called liberation (mokṣa), *which is reached by the Sāṁkhyas*, those who are devoted to Knowledge and have renounced the world, *is also reached by the Yogins.* The Yogins are those who perform their karmas (duties), as a means to the attainment of Knowledge, without aiming at fruits for their own enjoyment, but dedicating them to the Lord (Īśvara). By them as well is that (same) state reached, through the attainment of renunciation based on true Knowledge[7]; this is the meaning.

Therefore, *who sees Samkhya and Yoga as one*, because of their leading to the same result, *he sees truly.*

Question—If it be so, *sāṁnyāsa* must be superior to (*karma*)-*yoga.* How then has it been said that "Of these, performance of action is superior to renunciation of action" (V-2)?

Reply—Hear the reason for that (statement). Having in mind the mere renunciation of action and the mere performance

7. True Knowledge (*paramārtha-jñāna*) is that which produces the discernment that the entire universe of duality has no real existence, being merely the play of *māyā*, and that the Self, on the other hand, is the one Reality without a second and immutable. (Ā)

of action, you (Arjuna) enquired which of the two was the superior. In accordance with that question, the reply was given by Me that *karma-yoga* is superior to *karma-saṁnyāsa*, without having regard to Knowledge. But *Saṁnyāsa* which is related to Knowledge is considered by Me as *Samkhya*; and that is,in fact, the sublime (*Paramārtha*) *yoga*. But what is *karma-yoga* prescribed in the Vedas , that is only figuratively spoken of as *yoga* and *saṁnyāsa*, by reason of its being a means to that (supreme state).

How is it the means therefore? This is being told:

संन्यासस्तु महाबाहो दुःखमाप्तुमयोगतः ।
योगयुक्तो मुनिर्ब्रह्म न चिरेणाधिगच्छति ॥ ६ ॥

Saṁnyāsastu mahābāho duhkham-aptum-ayogataḥ
Yogayukto munir-brahma na cireṇādhigacchati

6. But renunciation of action, O mighty-armed, is hard to attain to without performance of action; the man of meditation, endowed with Yoga, reaches Brahman ere long.

But renunciation of action, namely the true (supreme) Saṁnyāsa, *O mighty-armed, is hard to attain to without the performance of action. The man of meditation*—on the form of Īśvara—, *endowed with Yoga*, the karma-yoga prescribed in the Vedas and performed without aiming at the results and as dedication to Īśvara, *reaches Brahman ere long*, quickly. True Saṁnyāsa, the topic under discussion, is here termed ' Brahman '; because it signifies devotion to the Knowledge of the Supreme Self (paramārtha-jñāna-niṣṭha), as is stated by Śruti: "What is known as Nyāsa (Renunciation) is Brahman; and Brahman is verily the Great" (*Maha-Na*-II-78),; and the man of meditation reaches supreme Saṁnyāsa, consisting in abidance in the Knowledge of the Supreme Self. Hence it was stated by Me that karma-yoga is the better, (because that alone takes one to Saṁnyasa).

And, when he (takes to Yoga) as a means to the attainment of Right Knowledge—

योगयुक्तो विशुद्धात्मा विजितात्मा जितेन्द्रियः ।
सर्वभूतात्मभूतात्मा कुर्वन्नपि न लिप्यते ॥ ७ ॥

Yoga-yukto viśuddhatma vijitātma jitendriyaḥ
Sarva-bhūtātma-bhūtātma kurvannapi na lipyate

7. With mind purified by devotion to performance of action, body conquered, and senses subdued, he, who has become the Self in all beings, though acting, is not tainted.

With mind purified (=viśuddha=sattva) *by devotion to the performance of action,* and the *body* (ātmā=deha) *conquered, and senses subdued*[8], *he, who,* i.e. whose Inner Consciousness, *has become the Self* in all beings, from Brahmā down to the blade of grass;—that is to say, the man of True Knowledge (perfect vision); who stays in such a state—*though acting,* being engaged in action for the guidance of the world (for the welfare of mankind), *is not tainted,* is not bound by actions.

And, in truths, such a person does nothing. Wherefore—

नैव किंचित्करोमीति युक्तो मन्येत तत्त्ववित् ।
पश्यञ्श्रृण्वन्स्पृशञ्जिघ्रन्नश्नन्गच्छन्स्वपञ्श्वसन् ॥ ८ ॥
प्रलपन्विसृजन्गृह्णन्नुन्मिषन्निमिषन्नपि ।
इन्द्रियाणीन्द्रियार्थेषु वर्तन्त इति धारयन् ॥ ९ ॥

Nava kiñcit-karomīti yukto manyeta tattva-vit
Pasyañ-śrnvan-spṛśañ-jighrann-aśnan-gacchan-
śvapan-svasan
Pralapan-visṛjan-gṛhṇann-unmiṣan-nimiṣannapi
Indriyāṇīndriyārtheṣu vartanta iti dhārayan

8. Through the performance of the prescribed *nitya* (usual) and *naimittika* (occasional) *karmas,* the mind becomes pure *sattva,* i.e. untainted by *rajas* and *tamas*; thereupon the body comes under control, and the senses as well. (Ā)

8–9. The knower of Truth, (being) centred (in the Self), should think, "I do nothing at all", though seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, eating, going, sleeping, breathing, speaking, letting go, holding, opening and closing the eyes,—convinced that it is the senses that move among sense-objects.

The knower of truth, he who knows the true nature of the Self, i.e., he who sees the supreme Reality, (being) *centred*, i.e. absorbed (in the Self), *should think*, have the idea, "*I do nothing at all*".

When and how should be think so, holding fast to the Truth? The answer follows: "*though seeing*,...............etc.".

The duty of the knower of Truth the man of Right Knowledge, who thus sees only inaction in all actions, in the movements of the senses and the mind, lies only in the total renunciation of action; for he sees the absence of activity (in himself). Indeed, no man who proceeded to drink, what has been deemed to be water, from a mirage, would continue to proceed towards it for the purpose of drinking (water) even after gaining the knowledge that it is not water.

As for the man who does not know the Truth and engages in *karma-yoga*—

ब्रह्मण्याधाय कर्माणि सङ्गं त्यक्त्वा करोति यः ।
लिप्यते न स पापेन पद्मपत्रमिवाम्भसा ॥ १० ॥

Brahmaṇyādhāya karmāṇi saṁgam tyaktvā karoti yaḥ
Lipyate na sa pāpena padma-patram-ivāmbhasa

10. He who does actions, resigning them to Brahman, forsaking attachment, is not soiled by evil, like unto a lotus leaf by water.

He who does all *actions, resigning them to Brahman*, depositing them in Īśvara, with the thought that he does them for His sake (III-9), as a servant does for his master, *forsaking attachment* even to such a result as moksa, *is not soiled*, bound, *by evil, like unto a lotus-leaf by water*[9].

The result of that action (performed in that manner) can only be the purification of the mind (*sattva-śuddhi*) and nothing else; because:

कायेन मनसा बुद्ध्या केवलैरिन्द्रियैरपि ।
योगिनः कर्म कुर्वन्ति सङ्गं त्यक्त्वाऽऽत्मशुद्धये ॥ ११ ॥

Kāyena manasā buddhyā kevalair-indriyāir -api
Yoginaḥ karma kurvanti saṁgam tyaktvā(ā)tma śuddhaye

11. Devotees in the path of Work perform action, merely by the body, mind, intellect and the senses, forsaking attachment, for the purification of the self.

Devotees in the path of Work, Karma-yogins, *perform action, merely by the body, mind, intellect, and the senses*,—the word 'merely' means that the idea of "mine-ness" is absent with reference to the body, etc., (and that the actions are done) in the spirit, "I perform actions for the sake of the Lord alone, and not for my benefit." 'Merely' is to be taken with every one of the words 'body' ('mind') etc., separately, for dissociating the idea of "mine-ness" from all operations—*forsaking attachment* in respect of the result, *for the purification of the self*, the mind. (ātma śuddhi = sattva-śuddhi).

Therefore, as your duty lies only there, do you engage yourself in action alone.

Because also—

युक्तः कर्मफलं त्यक्त्वा शान्तिमाप्नोति नैष्ठिकीम् ।
अयुक्तः कामकारेण फले सक्तो निबध्यते ॥ १२ ॥

9. Even though the lotus leaf grows in water, water does not attach to it.

Yuktah kārma-phalam tyaktvā śāntim-āpnoti naiṣṭhikīm
Ayuktah kāmakāreṇa phale sakto nibadhyate

12. The well-poised, forsaking the fruit of action, attains peace, born of steadfastness; the unbalanced one, led by desire, is bound by being attached to fruit (of action).

The well-poised, settled in mind that "actions are done for the sake of the Lord, not for my benefit", *forsaking,* abandoning *the fruit of action attains peace,* called mokṣa, *born of steadfastness,* through the following stages—purity of mind (sattva-śuddhi), attainment of knowledge, renunciation of all actions, and steadiness in knowledge. But he, *the unbalanced,* whose mind is unsettled, *led by desire,* through the action of desire—i.e. impelled by desire, *is bound, by being attached to fruit* (of action) by entertaining the thought, "I am engaging myself in this action for my benefit". Therefore, you should become well-poised.

But as for the man who sees the Supreme Reality—

सर्वकर्माणि मनसा संन्यस्यास्ते सुखं वशी ।
नवद्वारे पुरे देही नैव कुर्वन्न कारयन् ॥ १३ ॥

Sarva-karmāṇi manasā saṁnyasyāste sukham vaśī
Nava-dvāre pure dehī naiva kurvan-na kārayan

13. The embodied man of self-control, having renounced all actions by the mind, rests happily in the city of nine gates, without at all acting or causing to act.

The embodied man of self-control, having subdued the senses, and *having renounced all actions,* duties which are obligatory (nitya-karma), (and) those (duties) arising on the occurrence of some special events (naimittika-karmas), (as also) acts intended

for securing some special objects (kāmya-karmas), and those (acts) that are forbidden (pratiṣiddha-karmas), *by the mind,* by the faculty of discrimination, i.e. by seeing inaction in action and vice-versa, *rests happily*—

He is said to rest happily, becuase he has left off all actions of speech, mind and body, has no troubles, is composed in mind, and has ceased to care for all external interests to the exclusion of the Self. Where and how he (so) rests is now being stated—

in the city of nine gates: seven openings[10] in the head, being the gateways of perception, and two below, for the discharge of urine and excrement, constitute the nine openings. Having these nine openings, the body is spoken of as the city of nine gates. It is like a city, with the Self as the sole monarch, occupied by the citizens,—namely the senses, the mind, intellect, and their objects—employing themselves for the benefit of that monarch and producing knowledge of various objects. In that city of nine gates, the embodied rests, having renounced all action.

Objection—What is the need for the qualification ? (i.e. for qualifying 'the resting' with—'in the city of nine gates', i.e., 'the body'?) Verily, any person, whether saṁnyāsin or other, rests in (his) body only. The qualification is therefore meaningless.

Reply—As for the embodied person, who is devoid of discriminatory knowledge and sees himself merely as the combination of body and senses,—every such person thinks, "I rest in the house, on the ground, or on a seat"; and, indeed, to that man who sees the mere body as himself the idea that he rests in the body, as in a house, can never arise. On the other hand, the idea that he rests in a body is appropriate for him who sees the Self as distinct from the combination of body etc. And, it is possible for him to mentally renounce through wisdom, discriminatory knowledge, the actions of the (these) others (viz., body and senses) superimposed through ignorance on the Supreme Self. Even in the case of him who has attained discriminative knowledge and renounced all action, the (idea of) resting only in the body,

10. Two ears, two eyes, two nostrils, and the mouth for speech. (A)

the city of nine gates, as in a house, becomes possible (merely) because of the continued influence of the impression produced by the residue of his prārabdha-karma (the karma which brought about his present body) giving rise to the peculiar knowledge of resting in the body alone. Thus, there is significance in the expression, " he rests in the body alone ", owing to the need to bring out the difference between the conceptions of the wise and of the ignorant.

It has been stated that he rests renouncing actions, the body, and the senses, which are superimposed on the Self through ignorance; even so, there may still remain the capacity to do and cause to do, inhering in his Self. On this doubt, the Lord says—

without at all acting himself, *or causing to act,* impelling the body and the senses towards action.

Question—Is the capacity of the embodied being to act and cause to act inherent in the Self, and does it cease by renunciation,—as the motion of a walking man ceases on his giving up the activity of walking? Or, does it not pertain to the Self in its own nature? Which (of the two?)

Reply—The capacity to act or cause to act does not belong to the Self in its own nature. The Lord has declared: "This (Self) is said to be unchangeable" (II-25); "Though existing in the body, neither acts nor is tainted" (XIII-31). Śruti also says: " It thinks as it were, and moves as it were " (*Br.*IV-iii-7).

न कर्तृत्वं न कर्माणि लोकस्य सृजति प्रभुः ।
न कर्मफलसंयोगं स्वभावस्तु प्रवर्तते ॥ १४ ॥

Na kartṛtvam na karmāṇi lokasya sṛjati Prabhuḥ
Na karma-phala-saṁyogam svabhāvastu pravartate

14. Neither agency nor objects (to act upon) does the Lord create for the world, nor the union with the fruit of action. But it is Nature that acts.

Neither agency nor objects (to act upon) *does the Lord create for the world*: the Self, the Lord (of the body) does not create agency, i.e. He does not urge any one (to act)—"Do this"; nor does He create objects much-wished-for, like chariot, jar, or mansion; *nor the union with the fruit of action*, nor does He unite the maker of the chariot etc. with the fruit of the action (of making the chariot etc.)

If the Self, the Lord of the body, does not Himself act at all or cause another to act, who then is it that sets about acting and causing to act? The answer follows:

But it is Nature, svabhāva ('own state'), in the form of Avidya (also known as) Prakṛti (or) Māyā, which will be described as "This divine illusion of Mine" (VII-14).[11]

In reality—

नादत्ते कस्यचित्पापं न चैव सुकृतं विभुः ।
अज्ञानेनावृतं ज्ञानं तेन मुह्यन्ति जन्तवः ॥ १५ ॥

Nādatte kasyacit-pāpam na caiva sukṛtam vibhuḥ
Ajnānenāvṛtam jñānam tena muhyanti jantavaḥ

15. The Omnipresent takes no note of the demerit or the merit of any. Knowledge is enveloped in ignorance; hence do beings get deluded.

The Omnipresent takes no note of the demerit (evil) *or the merit* (good deeds) *of any*, not even of His devotee.

Question—Why is it, then, that meritorious acts, such as worship, and sacrifice, charity, offering of oblations etc., are practised by devotees?

11. Self appears as agent, enjoyer and over-lord, due to *Avidyā* (*Prakrti*, *Māyā*). That *Māyā* is different from the (*Prakrti or*) *Pradhāna* (of the Sāmkhya system) is supported by the quotation from VII. 14. (Ā) See also note 19 in Introduction.

The Lord says (by way of) *Reply*:—*Knowledge*, discriminative understandng (viveka-vijñāna), *is enveloped in ignorance; hence do beings*, the men of the world (saṁsārins), the ignorant, *get deluded*, by such thoughts as, "I do, I cause to act, I enjoy, I cause to enjoy".

ज्ञानेन तु तदज्ञानं येषां नाशितमात्मनः ।
तेषामादित्यवज्ज्ञानं प्रकाशयति तत्परम् ॥ १६ ॥

Jñānena tu tad-ajñānam yeṣām nāśitam-ātmanaḥ
Teṣam-ādityavaj-jñānam prakāśayati tat-param

16. But they in whom that ignorance is destroyed by Knowledge of the Self, for them that Knowledge of theirs reveals the Supreme, like the sun (revealing objects).

But they, those men, *in whom that ignorance*, enveloped by which beings become deluded, *is destroyed by Knowledge of the Self*, gets removed by the discriminative understanding concerning the Self, *for them, that Knowledge of theirs reveals the Supreme* Truth, the Whole, Knowable, Real, *like the sun*, who illuminates the whole aggregate of visible objects.

On the Supreme being revealed by Knowledge,

तद्बुद्धयस्तदात्मानस्तन्निष्ठास्तत्परायणाः ।
गच्छन्त्यपुनरावृत्तिं ज्ञाननिर्धूतकल्मषाः ॥ १७ ॥

Tadbuddhayast-tad-ātmānas-tān-niṣṭhās-tat-parāyaṇāh
Gacchantyapunarāvṛttim jñāna-nirdhūta-kalmaṣāh

17. Those who have their intellect absorbed in That, whose Self is That, whose steadfastness is in That, whose supreme goal is That,—their impurities cleansed by Knowledge, they attain to Non-return.

Those who have their intellect absorbed in That, whose Self is That, i.e. who realise that the Supreme Brahman is verily their Self, *whose steadfastness is in That*, whose resoluteness of purpose is directed towards That, i.e. renouncing all actions, who abide in Brahman alone, *whose supreme goal is That*, for whom Brahman becomes the supreme resort, that is to say, they delight solely in the Self;—they, whose ignorance (about the Self) has been destroyed by Knowledge—, *their impurities cleansed by Knowledge*, for whom sins and other blemishes giving rise to transmigratory existence (saṁsāra) have been destroyed by the Knowledge described above; *they*, the renouncers (" yatis "), *attain to Non-return*, non-connection with a new body any more (after the fall of their present body in death).

Now, the Lord proceeds to state how the wise men, whose ignorance has been destroyed by the Knowledge of the Self, see the Truth:

विद्याविनयसंपन्ने ब्राह्मणे गवि हस्तिनि ।
शुनि चैव श्वपाके च पण्डिताः समदर्शिनः ॥ १८ ॥

Vidyā-vinaya-saṁpanne Brāhmaṇe gavi hastini
Śuni caiva śvapāke ca paṇḍitāḥ sama darśinaḥ

18. In a Brāhmana endowed with wisdom and humility, a cow, an elephant, a dog, and a (low born) dog-eater, the wise see the Same.

In a Brāhmana endowed with wisdom, the knowledge of the Self, *and humility*, quietness[12], *a cow, an elephant, a dog, and a (low born) dog-eater, the wise see the Same.*

The Brāhmaṇa endowed with Wisdom and humility is the foremost, being purified by rites and sāttvic by nature. The cow, bereft of rites, and rājasic by nature, comes in the middle; and the elephant and others come last, being purely tāmasic[13]. The

12. Absence of egotism or arrogance. (Ā)

13. See chap. XIV for a description of the three *gunas* (*sattva, rajas* and *tamas*).

wise who 'see the Same' in all these are those who are habituated to perceive *the Same*, the One, the Immutable, Brahman—Who is absolutely untouched by the guṇas, sattva and others, and by the impress born of those guṇas, whether sāttvic, rājasic, or tāmasic.

Question—Are they (the wise spoken of) not blame-worthy persons, whose food-offering should not be accepted, as stated in *Smṛti*: "(He commits sin) who honours equals in different ways, or non-equals in the same manner" (*Gautama-Smṛti* XVII-20)?

Reply—They are not sinful persons; for

इहैव तैर्जितः सर्गो येषां साम्ये स्थितं मनः ।
निर्दोषं हि समं ब्रह्म तस्माद्ब्रह्मणि ते स्थिताः ॥ १९ ॥

Ihaiva tair-jitaḥ sargo yeṣām sāmye sthitam manaḥ
Nirdoṣam hi samam Brahma tasmād-Brahmāṇi te sthitāḥ

19. Even in this world has birth been conquered by them whose mind rests in Sameness. Since Brahman is spotless and even, therefore they rest in Brahman[14].

Even while living *in this world has birth been conquered,* brought under control, *by them,* the wise who see the Same (the One) *whose mind,* inner organ (antaḥ-karaṇa) *rests* steadfast *in Sameness*, the Identity that is Brahman in all creatures. *Since Brahman is spotless*—even though by the ignorant It is believed to be contaminated in the bodies of dog-eaters and the like by the blemishes of those bodies, nevertheless It is (in fact) untainted by those blemishes; and is therefore spotless. It does not vary on account of any diversity in its own characteristics, since Consciousness (Caitanya) is without any characteristic (nirguṇa). And the Lord says that desire and the like are the attributes of the Kṣetra

14. Since Brahman is spotless, those who rest in It are also spotless; and therefore birth is conquered by them: this is the connection. (Ā)

(body) (XIII-6) and that the Self is "Without beginning and devoid of guṇas" (XIII-31). Nor does It possess any 'ultimate characteristics' which can cause diversity in the Self, since there is no evidence of their existence in relation to each of several bodies[15]. Hence, Brahman is *even*, the same everywhere, and One. *Therefore, they rest* only *in Brahman.* Not even a trace of any blemish can affect them, for they do not have the conception of identifying the Self (themselves) with the combination of body etc. The aphorism referred to—"who honours equals in different ways or non-equals in the same manner (commits sin)"—concerns those who entertain the idea of viewing the aggregate of body etc. as the Self, because of the specific mention of the topic of honouring. It is indeed considered that the possession of special qualifications—such as being a knower of Brahman, one learned in the six Angas, one learned in the four Vedas, and the like—is a criterion in bestowing honour, gifts, etc. But Brahman is devoid of any connection with attributes, good and bad; hence, it has been appropriately stated that they (the Wise) rest in Brahman. Moreover, the aphorism "who honours equals, etc." is with regard to the man who is engaged in works; while the topic under consideration here, beginning from "Having renounced all actions by the mind" (V-13), upto the end of the Chapter, relates to the person who has renounced all action.

Since the spotless and even Brahman is the Self, therefore—

न प्रहृष्येत्प्रियं प्राप्य नोद्विजेत्प्राप्य चाप्रियम् ।
स्थिरबुद्धिरसंमूढो ब्रह्मविद् ब्रह्मणि स्थितः ॥ २० ॥

15. According to the Vaiśeṣikas, "ultimate characteristics" (*antya viśeṣas*) are the peculiar attributes inherent in each of the nine eternal substances (the five elements, Time, Space, Soul (Ātman) and Mind) which distinguish each of them from the rest. *Antya-viseṣas* in the Ātman can be inferred only from some peculiar attribute in the Self, which is denied by Vedanta. And since a yogin can assume various bodies at the same time, difference in bodies cannot mean distinctions in the Self. (*Vaiśeṣika* is allied to the Indian Logic of *Nyāya* and mainly deals with the categories touching the ultimate realities of Self and the universe. It is also among the dualistic philosophies and is therefore refuted by the non-duatistic Vedānta or Uttara-Mimāṁsa of Śri Śaṁkara.)

Na prahṛṣyet-priyam prāpya nodvijet prāpya cāpriyam

Sthira-buddhir-asammūḍho Brahmavid-Brahmaṇi sthitaḥ

20. The knower of Brahman can neither rejoice on obtaining the pleasant nor grieve on obtaining the unpleasant, with (his) intellect steady and without delusion, resting in Brahman.

The knower of Brahman, described above *can neither rejoice*, feel pleasure, *on obtaining the pleasant*, a desireable object, *nor grieve*, even *on obtaining the unpleasant*, that which is not desirable. It is only for those who see the mere body as the Self that obtaining the pleasant or the unpleasant becomes (respectively) the occasion for rejoicing or grieving; not for him who sees the pure secondless Self, since it is not possible for him to find either pleasant or unpleasant objects. And besides, the knower of Brahman, is *with* (his) *intellect steady*, has the understanding absolutely free from uncertainty, fixed in the truth that the Self is One and the same in all beings and spotless, *and without delusion*; (and also is) *resting in Brahman*, that is to say, he does no action and renounces all action[16].

And besides, he who rests in Brahman—

बाह्यस्पर्शेष्वसक्तात्मा विन्दत्यात्मनि यत्सुखम् ।
स ब्रह्मयोगयुक्तात्मा सुखमक्षय्यमश्नुते ॥ २१ ॥

16. It is impossible for the knower of Brahman either to rejoice or to grieve, firstly because he cannot meet with such distinctions as the pleasant and the unpleasant, he being ever conscious of the Self which is One without a second; also because, having a firm perception of the spotless Brahman, he is free from delusion which is the cause of joy and grief; and also since he rests in Brahman he cannot tolerate any kind of activity, such as experiencing joy or grief. (Ā)

Bāhya-sparśeṣvasaktātmā vindatyātmani yat-sukham
Sa Brahma-yoga-yuktātmā sukham-akṣayyam-aśnute

21. With the self unattached to external contacts, he realises the joy that is in the Self. With the self devoted to the meditation of Brahman, he attains undecaying happiness.

With the self, the mind (antaḥ-karaṇa), *unattached to external contacts*, those that are external and are contacted (by the senses) namely sense-objects, sound and the rest,—*he*, such a person devoid of liking for sense-objects, *realises*, finds, *the joy that is in the Self*. *With the self*, the mind (antaḥ-karaṇa), *devoted to the meditation of Brahman*, engaged in concentration on Brahman, *he attains undecaying happiness*[17].

Therefore, the import is that one who is after undecaying happiness should turn back his senses from the fondness for external objects, which is momentary.

For the following reason also, he should turn back (the senses from their objects)—

ये हि संस्पर्शजा भोगा दुःखयोनय एव ते ।
आद्यन्तवन्तः कौन्तेय न तेषु रमते बुधः ॥ २२ ॥

Ye hi saṁsparśajā bhogā duḥkha-yonaya eva te
Ādyantavantaḥ Kaunteya na teṣu ramate budhaḥ

17. Joy, which is the real nature of the Self, becomes manifest, by degrees, as and when attachment towards sense-objects is got rid of. He who rests in Brahman does not merely get the joy that comes through the control of the senses by practising non-attachment (to sense-objects); he possesses the unsurpassed bliss arising from perfect Knowledge following concentration on Brahman. (Ā)

22. Since enjoyments which are contact-born are only generators of misery, and are with a beginning and an end, O son of Kuntī, a wise man does not seek pleasure in them.

Since enjoyments, which are contact-born, produced by the contacts of the senses with the (respective) sense-objects, *are only generators of misery*, having been caused by nescience (avidyā)—The (three kinds of) miseries, those arising in the body (ādhyātmika) and the others (i.e., the two other miseries, produced by living beings and by fate), are indeed seen (from experience) to be produced by them (enjoyments). The word '*only*' suggests that, as in this world, so in the other world as well. Realising that there is not even a trace of happiness in saṁsāra, one should turn back his senses from the mirage of sense-objects.

Enjoyments are not merely productive of misery; *they are* besides *with a beginning and an end*: the beginning of enjoyment is the contact of a sense with its object, and the end is the separation of the two. Thus, being with a beginning and an end, they are transient, existing in the moment of interval.

O son of Kuntī! a wise man, the man of discrimination, who has known the Supreme Truth, *does not seek pleasure in them*, it is only the extremely stupid people who are seen to revel in sense-objects, as do cattle and the like.

And, there is this most mischievous evil, an enemy on the path to felicity (Freedom, Bliss, *Mokṣa*), the source which leads to all calamity, and very difficult to ward off. To get rid of it, therefore, superlative effort is called for; so, says the Lord—

शक्नोतीहैव यः सोढुं प्राक्शरीरविमोक्षणात् ।
कामक्रोधोद्भवं वेगं स युक्तः स सुखी नरः ॥ २३ ॥

Śaknotīhaiva yaḥ soḍhum prāk-śarīra-vimokṣaṇāt
Kāma-krodhodbhavam vegam sa yuktaḥ sa sukhī naraḥ

23. He who can withstand even here, before (his) liberation from the body, the impulse of desire and anger, he is steadfast (real yogin), he is the happy man.

He who can withstand, is capable of withstanding, overcoming *even here,* while yet living, *before* (*his*) *liberation from the body,* upto the time of (his) death (the impulse of desire and anger):—Death is fixed as the limit, because the impulse arising from desire and anger is inevitable for a living being, being caused in countless ways; and so upto the moment of death it should not be kept in intimacy (i.e. it should be kept at a distance). The eagerness, the longing, for an agreeable object, which has (once) been experienced as giving pleasure, when it (again) comes within the range of the senses or is heard of or remembered, is desire. The abhorrence for the objects disagreeable to oneself and which are the cause of pain, when (again) seen or heard of or remembered, is anger. The impulse which desire or anger produces is said to be the impulse of desire or anger. The impulse arising from desire is the agitation of mind (antaḥ-karaṇa) indicated by hairs standing on end, joyous eyes and cheerful countenance; and the impulse of anger is indicated by violent motion of the body, perspiration, biting of the lips, ruddy eyes, etc. He who is capable of withstanding, overcoming, *the impulse of desire and anger is* the *steadfast* person, a (Real) Yogin; and *he is the happy man* here, on earth.

What sort of person, resting in Brahman, attains Brahman? The Lord says—

योऽन्तः सुखोऽन्तरारामस्तथाऽन्तर्ज्योतिरेव यः ।
स योगी ब्रह्मनिर्वाणं ब्रह्मभूतोऽधिगच्छति ॥ २४ ॥

Yo(a)ntaḥ sukho(a)ntarārāmas-tathā(a)ntar-
jyotir-eva yaḥ

Sa yogī Brahma-nirvāṇam Brahmabhūto
(a)dhigacchati

24. Whose happiness is within, whose pleasure is within, whose light is also within only, that Yogin, becoming Brahman, attains to the bliss of Brahman.

Whose happiness is within—in the inner Self; so also, *whose pleasure is within*, whose sport is in the inner Self alone; *whose light*, illumination, *is also within only*—is the inner Self Itself; *that Yogin*—the Yogin of this description, *becoming Brahman, attains to the bliss of Brahman*, absolute freedom in Brahman, i.e. Mokṣa, while still living in the body on earth.

Besides[18],

लभन्ते ब्रह्मनिर्वाणं ऋषयः क्षीणकल्मषाः ।
छिन्नद्वैधा यतात्मानः सर्वभूतहिते रताः ॥ २५ ॥

Labhante Brahma-nirvāṇam ṛṣayah kṣīṇakalmaṣāḥ
Chinnadvaidhā yatātmānaḥ sarva-bhūta-hite ratāḥ

25. The Ṛṣis obtain absolute freedom in Brahman with (their) blemishes destroyed, doubts dispelled, self controlled, and intent on the good of all beings.

The Ṛṣis, men of right vision and renunciation, *obtain absolute freedom in Brahman*, mokṣa, *with* their *blemishes*, such as sins and the rest, *destroyed, doubts dispelled, self controlled*—i.e. with their senses subdued, *and intent on the good of all beings*, taking delight in doing what is favourable to all beings, that is to say, abstaining from giving pain to others[19].

18. Exclusive devotion to the Self is the most intimate requisite of Knowledge. Another means to Knowledge leading to Mokṣa is now stated: Through the performance of prescribed duties (*nitya-karma*) such as sacrifices, blemishes like sin are effaced; and thereafter by the practice of *Śravaṇa* etc., Right Knowledge arises, whereupon Liberation comes without effort. (Ā)

19. Yet another means to knowledge is in this manner: Through *Śravaṇa* etc. doubts get dispelled and the body and the senses become controlled; compassion leads to harmlessness; and these virtues also lead up to Right Knowledge. (Ā)

Moreover[20],

कामक्रोधवियुक्तानां यतीनां यतचेतसाम् ।
अभितो ब्रह्मनिर्वाणं वर्तते विदितात्मनाम् ॥ २६ ॥

Kāma-krodha-viyuktānām yatīnām yata-cetasām
Abhito Brahma-nirvāṇam vartate viditātmanām

26. To the ascetics, free from desire and anger, with mind controlled, and the Self realised, absolute freedom in Brahman exists here and hereafter.

To the ascetics, saṁnyāsins, *free from desire and anger, with mind* (antaḥ-karaṇa) *controlled, and the Self realised,*—to such men of true vision, *absolute freedom in Brahman*, mokṣa, *exists here and hereafter*, while they are yet living (in the body) and after death.

In the case of those who are steadfast in Right Knowledge and have renounced action, instantaneous release (Sadyo-mukti) has been predicated. And at every step, the Lord has also stated that karma-yoga, performed in the spirit of dedication to Īśvara with one's whole being[21] and offered to Īśvara (Brahman) leads to mokṣa (step by step) in due course[22], through purification of mind (sattva-śuddhi), gaining Knowledge (jñāna-prāpti) and renunciation of all action; and this He will be repeating (hereafter also). And now, proceeding to expound in detail Dhyāna-Yoga, (The Way of Meditation), which is an intimate means to Right Knowledge, He teaches the following (two) verses which stand in the position of *sūtras*[23] on the subject.

20. It was previously explained (verse 23) that the impulse of desire and anger should be endured (withstood). Now, it is being taught that they themselves should be avoided. (Ā)

21. *Sarva-bhavena*—the actions of the body, senses, and mind, having been dedicated to Isvara, are not employed anywhere outside. (Ā)

22. This is called *krama mukti*.

23. A *sūtra* is a concise technical sentence used as a mnemonic rule. It is thus defined: *svalpākṣaram asaṁdigdham sāravad-viśvatomukham, astobham anavadyam ca sūtram sūtravido viduḥ*—i.e., it must be of minimum-syllables, clear-cut, thoroughly sapful, without pausses and faultless. The Sixth Chapter is the detailed commentary on these verses (27 and 28).

स्पर्शान्कृत्वा बहिर्बाह्यांश्चक्षुश्चैवान्तरे भ्रुवोः ।
प्राणापानौ समौ कृत्वा नासाभ्यन्तरचारिणौ ॥ २७ ॥
यतेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धिर्मुनिर्मोक्षपरायणः ।
विगतेच्छाभयक्रोधो यः सदा मुक्त एव सः ॥ २८ ॥

Sparśān-kṛtvā bahir-bāhyāmś-cakṣuś-caivantare bhruvoḥ
Praṇāpānau samau kṛtvā nāsābhyantara-cārinau

Yatendriya-mano-buddhir-munir-mokṣa-parāyaṇaḥ
Vigatecchābhaya-krodho yah sadā mukta eva saḥ

27-28. Having shut out external contacts and fixed the eyes between the eye-brows, and made even (equalised) the *prāṇa* and *apāna* coursing through the nostrils; with the senses, mind and intellect controlled, and with mokṣa as the supreme goal;—such a *muni*, devoid of desire, fear and anger, is verily free for ever.

Having shut out external contacts, namely, sound and other sense-objects. Sense-objects, such as sound, enter into the mind (buddhi) through the respective senses, such as the ear; when man does not care to mind these, which are merely external, they are in fact kept outside. Having thus kept them out, *and* having *fixed the eyes between the eye-brows, and made even the prāṇa and apāna coursing through the nostrils*[24];

with the senses, mind and intellect controlled, and with mokṣa as the supreme goal;—remaining in the body in the condition described, but ever intent on mokṣa as his supreme station;

such a muni, the man of meditation, he who has renounced all action, *devoid of desire, fear and anger, is verily free for ever*: for him moksa is not something alien to be striven after.

24. (See IV-29 and com.). The condition specified refers to Kumbhaka. (Ā)

What is that to be known by him of mind so composed?[25] The Lord says:

भोक्तारं यज्ञतपसां सर्वलोकमहेश्वरम् ।
सुहृदं सर्वभूतानां ज्ञात्वा मां शान्तिमृच्छति ॥ २९ ॥

Bhoktāram yajña-tapasām Sarva-loka-Maheśvaram
Suhṛdam sarva-bhūtānām jñātva mām śāntim-ṛcchati

29. Knowing Me as the user of Yajñās and austerities, as the Great Lord of all the worlds, as the Friend of all beings, he attains Peace.

Knowing Me, Nārāyaṇa, *as the user of yajñās and austerities,* in the forms of the performer and the deity propitiated, *as the Great Lord, of all the worlds, and as the Friend of all beings*—doing good to them, without expecting any return; knowing Me, Nārāyaṇa, reposing in the heart of all beings, the Supervisor of all actions and their fruits, and the virtues of all cognitions, *he attains Peace,* the cessation of all saṁsāra.

इति श्रीमहाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्यां भीष्मपर्वणि
श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु ब्रह्मविद्यायां योगशास्त्रे
श्रीकृष्णार्जुनसंवादे कर्मसंन्यासयोगो नाम
पञ्चमोऽध्यायः ॥

Iti Śrī-Mahābhārate śatasāhasryām saṁhitāyām Vaiyāsikyām Bhīṣma-Parvaṇi Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītāsūpaniṣatsu Brahma-vidyāyām yogaśāstre Śrī Kṛṣṇārjuna-samvāde Karma-saṁnyāsa-yogo nāma pañcamo(a)dhyāyaḥ.

25. When such a *muni* has nothing further to *do,* there need be nothing for him to know either: this doubt is being answered. (Ā)

Thus the fifth chapter entitled ' Way of Renunciation of Action '[26] in the Upaniṣads known as ' The Celebrated Songs of the Lord' expounding the Knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna—embodied in the Bhīṣma-Parva of Śrī Mahābhārata, the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyāsa.

26. The name of this Chapter according to the Bhāṣya is *Prakṛti-garbha*, ,, Womb of Nature ".

॥ षष्ठोऽध्यायः ॥
(ध्यानयोगः)

ṢAṢṬHO(A)DHYĀYAḤ
(DHYĀNA YOGAḤ)

CHAPTER - VI
(WAY OF MEDITATION)

At the end of the preceding chapter, the verses, " Having shut out external contacts........ " etc. (V-27 to 29), standing in the position of *sūtras* on *Dhyāna-yoga* (The spiritual discipline of meditation) which is the intimate means to Right Rnowledge, have been taught; (now) this sixth chapter, occupying the position of a commentary thereon, commences.

Karma (action) is an external aid to *Dhyāna-yoga*; and the householder, on whom action is enjoined, should perform it, so long as he is unable to rise up to *Dhyāna-yoga*. Foi this reason, the Lord extols it in VI-1.

Objection[1]— When action has been enjoined for performance throughout life, why the setting of the limit (for the performance of action) upto rising to *Dhyāna-yoga*?

Reply—The objection is pointless; because of the particularisation, " For the *muni* who wishes to attain to (*Dhyana*) *Yoga*, work is said to be the means " (VI-3), and because when he has attained to (that) *Yoga*, he is associated with inaction (*śama*) only. Had it been intended that both inaction (*śama*) and action (work) (*karma*) should be practised by both the person who wishes to attain to *Yoga* and also by him who has attained to *Yoga*, then it would be purposeless to particularise that '*śama*' and '*karma*' are the different objects respectively for the man who has attained to Yoga and for him who wishes to attain to it, and to classify them separately.

1. The objector is the *samuccaya-vādin* (Ā), who holds that action and Knowledge should be practised together.

Objection—Among the religious orders (*āśramins*), one person wishes to attain to *Yoka*, another has attained to *Yoga*, and a third (set) are persons who have neither attained to *Yoga* nor wish to attain to *Yoka*; with reference to this third set, it is proper to particularise and mention separately the first two sets of persons.

Reply—No. Because of the words, "For the same person (*tasyaiva*)" (VI-3). And, from the repetition of the word '*Yoga*' in "when he has attained to *Yoga*" (VI-3), it is meant that for the very person, who first wished to attain to *Yoga*, when he had attained to *Yoga*, inaction (*śama*) is to be adopted as the means for the fruition of *Yoga*. Thus, no action whatever is to be deemed as prescribed for performance throughout life.

Also because of the mention of falling from *Yoga* (VI-37, 38). If, in (this) sixth chapter, *Yoka* be enjoined for the householder, i.e. the performer of action, then there can be no apprehension about his ruin, since he would obtain the due result, the fruit of his actions (*karma*), even though fallen from *Yoga*. For, any action done, whether it be done with a view to a result (*kāmya-karma*) or whether it be obligatory (*nitya-karma*), necessarily produces its result; but *mokṣa* being eternal cannot be produced (by any action). And, we have already stated[2] that an obligatory duty, taught by the authority of the Veda, must produce its fruit; as otherwise the Veda would become purposeless. Moreover, with respect to the householder, who must continue performing *karma*, it would be meaningless to speak of him as fallen from both (the path of Knowledge and the path of action), since there is no occasion for his falling from (the path of) action.

Objection—The action performed has been offered to the Lord (Īśvara)[3]; and hence his action cannot originate any fruit for the doer.

Reply—No; because it stands to reason that offering (of action) to Īśvara produces even greater result.

2. Vide Com. on IV-18.

3. The person fallen from *Yoga*, being a seeker of liberation (*mumukṣu*). (Ā)

Objection—His action can lead only to *mokṣa*. Dedication to Īśvara of duties performed by him, conjoined with *Yoga*, must lead only to *mokṣa*, and not to any other result; but having fallen from *Yoga*, it is reasonable to suppose, in his case, that he would be ruined[4].

Reply—It is not so[5]. (Also) because the passages, "Alone, with mind and body controlled, free from desire and possession" (VI-10), and "firm in the vow of a Brahmacārin" (VI-14), prescribe the renunciation of action; and there can be no question of the need for the wife's assistance at the time of *Dhyāna*, by reason of which loneliness could have been enjoined (on a householder)[6]. Moreover, the phrase, "free from desire and possession" is incompatible with the householder's life and the question regarding fall from both paths (VI-38) cannot arise in his case[7].

Objection—In the verse, "Without leaning (to the fruit of action)" (VI-1), it is stated with regard to the man of action (*karmin*) alone that he can be both a *saṁnyāsin* and a *yogin;* and this combination of being a *saṁnyāsin* and a *yogin* is precluded with regard to the man who is without fire and without action.

Reply—Not so. The verse (VI-1) is only in praise of the abandonment of the desire for the fruit of action, which is an external aid to *Dhyāna-yoga*. The meaning of the verse is that it is not only the person who has quitted fire and action who is a *saṁnyāsin* and a *yogin*; but even the man performing action who,

4. (According to the objector, the *samuccaya-vādin*) the dedication of all action to the Lord, combined with the practice of *Dhyāna*, leads to *mokṣa*. With the failure of the co-operating factor (*Dhyāna*), the means (to *mokṣa*) become incomplete and will not lead to the fruit. (Ā)

5. There is no authority for the view that dedication of one's actions to the Lord combined with *dhyāna* leads to *mokṣa*. The householder cannot therefore be the subject of the enquiry in verses 37 and 38. (Ā)

6. For performing *Agnihotra* the wife's aid is necessary, but not for *dhyāna*; and so there would be the fallacy of prohibition of what is not a general rule (*aprāpta-pratiṣedha*). (Ā)

7. Because, even if the householder drops away from the action he is engaged in, he will get the fruit of the actions previously performed by him. (Ā)

abandoning the attachment to the fruit of action, engages himself in *karma-yoga* for the purification of his mind, is also extolled as being a *saṁnyāsin* and a *yogin*. It would also be unreasonable to hold that one and the same declaration should praise the renunciation of the attachment to the fruits of action and exclude the fourth order (*saṁnyāsa*)[8]. And the Lord does not deny that the man without fire and without action—who is exactly the *saṁnyāsin*—is a *samnyasin* and a *yoki*, as is well-known as settled by the Śruti, the Smṛti, the Purāṇas, the Itihāsas and the Yoga-śāstras. To preclude the fourth order would also contradict the Lord's own statements made in several places, such as:

"Having renounced all actions by the mind,.......... without at all acting, or causing to act" (V.13);

"Who is silent, content with anything, homeless, steady-minded" (XII-19);

"That man, who abandoning all desires, moves about, devoid of longing" (II-71);

"Renouncing all undertakings" (XII-16).

Therefore, for the muni[9], who desires to attain to *Yoga* and has engaged himself in the house-holder's life, action such as the *Agnihotra* performed without the desire for the fruit becomes, by way of purification of the mind, a mea s of rising to *Dhyāna-yoga*. And so, he is being extolled as a *saṁnyāsin* and a *yogin*:

श्री भगवानुवाच—

अनाश्रितः कर्मफलं कार्यं कर्म करोति यः ।
स संन्यासी च योगी च न निरग्निर्न चाक्रियः ॥ १ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Anāśritaḥ karma-phalam kāryam karma karoti yaḥ
Sa saṁnyāsi ca yogī ca na niragnir-na cākriyaḥ

8. See note I, Chapter V, about *vākya-bheda*.

9. *Muni* here means the renouncer of the fruit of action. (Ā) See also Com. on V.6; VI.3.

The Blessed Lord said—

1. He who, without leaning to the fruit of action, performs his bounden duty, he is a *saṁnyāsin* and a *yogin*: not he (alone) who is without fire and without action.

He who, without leaning to the fruit of action, devoid of desire for the fruit of action. One who has the desire for the fruit of action becomes dependent on it, but the man in question is the opposite of him and is therefore not dependent on the fruit of action. He who is of this description and *performs his bounden duty*, i.e. the nityakarma, Agnihotra and others, the opposite of kāmya-karma (action done with motive for attaining some desired result): he who performs actions thus is superior to other performers of action. To convey this sense, the Lord says:

He is a saṁnyāsin and a yogin. Saṁnyāsa is renunciation, and yoga is composure of mind; the person under reference must be deemed as one possessed of these virtues. It should *not* be thought that only *he* is a saṁnyāsin and a yogin *who is without fire and without action*—he who is bereft of the fires which are essential for the performance of rites, and who does not also engage in actions not requiring the sacrificial fires, such as austerities and munificence.

Objection—It is well-known from the *Śruti*, the *Smṛti*, and the *Yoga-śāstras* that only a person who is without fire and without action is a *saṁnyāsin* and a *yogin*; how then is it taught here that one who maintains the fire and performs actions is a *saṁnyāsin* and a *yogin*—a matter unheard of?

Reply—There is nothing wrong in this; for the (Lord's) intention is to obtain (for such a house-holder) the status of both (a *saṁnyāsin* and a *yogin*) in some secondary sense.

Objection—How is that?

Reply—One's being regarded as a *saṁnyāsin* arises from his abandonment of the thought of the fruit of action; and being regarded as a *yogin* arises from his performance of action as an

auxiliary to Yoga, or from his giving up the thought of the fruit of action which would bring about distraction of the mind. Thus, it is in a secondary sense that both terms are used. On the other hand, it is not intended that he is a *saṁnyāsin* and a *yogin* in the primary (or literal) sense. To bring out this idea, the Lord says:

यं संन्यासमिति प्राहुर्योगं तं विद्धि पाण्डव ।
न ह्यसंन्यस्तसंकल्पो योगी भवति कश्चन ॥ २ ॥

Yam saṁnyāsam-iti prāhur-yogam tam viddhi Pāṇḍava
Na hyasaṁnyasta-saṁkalpo yogī bhavati kaścana

2. That which they call saṁnyāsa (renunciation), know yoga to be that, O Paṇḍava; for none becomes a yogin without renouncing saṁkalpa[10].

That characterised by the renunciation of all action together with the fruit (of all action), *which they* who are learned in the Śruti and the Smṛti *call saṁnyāsa,* renunciation in the true sense (Paramartha), *know Yoga,* characterised by the performance of (disinterested) action, *to be that,* i.e. the true renunciation, *O Pāṇḍava.*

The question arises: recognising what similarity between karma-yoga—which consists in the performance of action—and its opposite, the true renunciation—which consists in withdrawal from action, is the former said to be the same as the latter? This is the reply: there is some similarity between karma-yoga and true saṁnyāsa when viewed in relation to the agent. Since he has renounced all actions together with the means (of executing them), he who is a true saṁnyāsin abandons (even) the thought about all actions and their fruits and thereby any inclination prompt-

10. Of the many meanings the word "*saṁkalpa*" has, the revered Commentator here adopts, as suitable to the context, the meanings "desire" in general and "expectation of advantage from a holy act" in particular—as is borne out in the commentary following.

ing action. The karma-yogin in question, as well, while performing action, gives up the thought of the fruit of action. Explaining this import, the Lord says—

For none, no performer of action, *becomes a yogin*, can become a man of composed mind, *without renouncing saṁkalpa*, without abandoning thought of the fruit of action; since it is the thought of the fruit that brings about distraction of the mind. The import therefore is that only such a performer of action as gives up the thought of the fruit, can become a yogi, a man of composure, one whose mind is not distracted,—because what causes distraction of mind, namely the thought of the result, has been renounced.

Thus, in consideration of the sameness between true saṁnyāsa and karma-yoga when viewed in relation to the agent, karma-yoga has been represented as saṁnyāsa in the words, "That which they call saṁnyāsa, know Yoga to be that, O Pāṇḍava", with a view to extolling it.

Having praised *karma-yoga* devoid of the desire for the result as *saṁnyāsa*, because it is an external aid to *Dhyāna-yoga*, the Lord now discloses how it is the means to *Dhyāna-yoga*:

आरुरुक्षोर्मुनेर्योगं कर्म कारणमुच्यते ।
योगारूढस्य तस्यैव शमः कारणमुच्यते ॥ ३ ॥

Ārurukṣor-muner-yogam karma kāraṇam-ucyate
Yogārūḍhasya tasyaiva śamaḥ kāraṇam-ucyate

3. For the *muni* who wishes to attain to *Yoga*, work is said to be the means; for the same person, when he has attained to *Yoga*, inaction (*śama*) is said to be the means.

For the muni, i.e. the person who has given up the fruit of action, *who wishes to attain to Yoga*, (but) who has not risen up (to it), that is to say, who is quite unable to remain in Dhyāna-

yoga, *work* (karma) *is said to be the means* to the desired end[11]. And on the other hand, *for the same person, when he has attained to Yoga, inaction* (śama), quietude, abstention from all actions, *is said to be the means* by which establishment in Yoga has been attained. To the extent he abstains from action, to that extent he, free from worry and with his senses subdued, gets composure of mind. Accordingly, he quickly becomes a "yogārūḍha," one who has attained to Yoga. And, so has it been stated by Vyāsa:

"For a Brāhmaṇa there is no wealth like unto (the perception) of one-ness, (and) even-ness, true-ness, character, steadiness, harmlessness, straightforwardness, and gradual withdrawal from all actions." (M.B. Śānti. 175-38).

And now, it is being stated when one does become a *yogārūḍha*:

यदा हि नेन्द्रियार्थेषु न कर्मस्वनुषज्जते ।
सर्वसंकल्पसंन्यासी योगारूढस्तदोच्यते ॥ ४ ॥

Yadā hi nendriyārtheṣu na karmasvanuṣajjate
Sarva-saṁkalpa-saṁnyāsī yogārūḍhas-tadocyate

4. Verily, when he has no attachment either to the objects of the senses or to actions, then is he, having renounced all *saṁkalpas*, said to be *yogārūḍha*.

Verily, when he, the yogi keeping his mind composed, *has no attachment, either to the objects of the senses* such as sound etc., *or to actions* whether obligatory, incidental, motivated or prohibited (nitya, naimittika, kāmya, pratiṣiddha): The meaning is that, with the belief that they are of no use, he does not entertain the idea that he has to perform them, —*then*, at that moment, *is he, having renounced all saṁkalpas*, having given up all plans which are the cause of the desire for objects of this world and the next, *said to be yogārūḍha*, one who has attained to Yoga. By

11. The desired end is attainment of *Dhyāna-yoga*; and *karma* is the means thereto, by purifying the mind and bringing about a desire for it (*Dhyāna Yoga*) (Ā)

the phrase, 'having renounced all saṁkalpas', it is meant that he should give up all desires as well as all actions; for, all desires are born of thought, as Smṛti says:

"Desire verily springs from thought, and from thought are born *yajñas*" (*Manu.* II-3).

"O desire, I know where your root lies; you are verily born of *saṁkalpa.* I shall not think of you, and then you shall cease to exist for me." (*M.B. Śānti.* 177-25).

And, on the abandonment of all desire, the renunciation of all action is achieved, as shown in passages of the *Śruti* and *Smṛti* such as:

"Whatsoever he desires, that he resolves to do; whatever he resolves to do, that he executes in action" (*Bṛ.* IV-iv-5).

"Whatever action a person performs, all that is the work of desire". (*Manu.* II-4).

Reasoning also points to the same conclusion: for, on giving up all thoughts, none can even move.[12]

To sum up: By the words, "having renounced all *saṁkalpas*", the Lord directs the giving up of all desires and all actions.

When a person thus attains to *Yoga,* then his self becomes lifted up by himself from *saṁsāra*, the multitude of evils. Therefore,

उद्धरेदात्मनाऽऽत्मानं नात्मानमवसादयेत् ।
आत्मैव ह्यात्मनो बन्धुरात्मैव रिपुरात्मनः ॥ ५ ॥

Uddhared-ātmanā(ā)tmānam nātmānam-avasādayet
Ātmaiva hyātmano bandhur-ātmaiva ripur-
ātmanaḥ

12. As for instance, in sleep. (A)

5. A man should uplift himself by his own self; let him not sink himself. For, he alone is the friend of himself; he alone is the enemy of himself.

A man, who is submerged in the ocean of saṁsāra, *should uplift himself* from out of it: that is to say, he should bring about the state of "yogārūḍha"; *let him not sink himself*, bring himself down, ruin himself. *For he alone is the friend of himself*: indeed, there is no other friend who can release him from saṁsāra; even a friend, being a seat of bondage such as affection, is really unfavourable as regards *mokṣa*. Hence the affirmation—"he ALONE is the friend of himself"—is appropriate. *He alone is the enemy of himself*: even an enemy, other than oneself, who inflicts harm and is outside, is made an enemy by himself (one's own self) alone; hence the emphasis, "he ALONE is the enemy of himself".

It has been stated that, "He alone is the friend of himself; he alone is the enemy of himself". Here, the question arises: 'What sort of person is the friend of himself; and what sort of person is the enemy of himself?' The reply follows:

बन्धुरात्माऽऽत्मनस्तस्य येनात्मैवात्मना जितः ।
अनात्मनस्तु शत्रुत्वे वर्तेतात्मैव शत्रुवत् ॥ ६ ॥

Bandhur-ātmā(ā)tmanas-tasya yenātmaivātmanā jitaḥ
Anātmanastu śatrutve vartetātmaiva śatruvat.

6. His own self is the friend of himself, for him who has conquered himself verily by himself. But to one who has not conquered himself, his own self verily is in the position of an enemy, like (an external) foe.

His own self is a friend of himself, for him who has conquered himself, subdued the aggregate of the body and the senses *verily by himself*: that is to say, for him who he is self-controlled. *But*

to one who has not conquered himself, the man who is not self-controlled, *his own self verily is in the position of an enemy, like (an external) foe*; just as a foe different from himself inflicts harm on him, in the same manner does his own self act injuriously towards him.

जितात्मनः प्रशान्तस्य परमात्मा समाहितः ।
शीतोष्णसुखदुःखेषु तथा मानापमानयोः ॥ ७ ॥

Jitātmanaḥ praśāntasya paramātmā samāhitaḥ
Śītoṣṇa-sukha-dukḥṣu tathā mānāpamānayoḥ

7. To the self-controlled and serene, the Supreme Self is steadfast—in cold and heat, pleasure and pain, as well as in honour and dishonour.

To the self-controlled and serene saṁnyāsin who has brought under control the aggregate of the body and the senses and whose mind (antaḥ-karaṇa) is calm, *the Supreme Self is steadfast*: It is (ever) directly seen to be his own Self. And, besides, he remains the same *in cold and heat, pleasure and pain, as well as in honour and dishonour*[13].

ज्ञानविज्ञानतृप्तात्मा कूटस्थो विजितेन्द्रियः ।
युक्त इत्युच्यते योगी समलोष्टाश्मकाञ्चनः ॥ ८ ॥

Jñāna-vijñāna-tṛptātmā kūṭastho vijitendriyaḥ
Yukta ityucyate yogī sama-loṣṭāśma-kañcanaḥ

8. He whose self is satisfied by Wisdom and Realisation, he is changeless, (and) his senses are conquered: he is said to be steadfast. To that yogin, a lump of earth, a stone, and gold are the same.

13. A reference to the attribute of yoga. (Ā)

He whose self, mind (antaḥ-karaṇa) *is satisfied,* has attained the feeling of satiety, *by Wisdom and Realisation,* by the knowledge of objects as taught in scripture and the realisation by personal experience of the truths as learnt from scripture;—*he is changeless,* he becomes unshakeable; *and his senses are conquered; he,* such a person, *is said to be steadfast,* composed[14]. *To that yogin, a lump of earth, a stone, and gold are the same.*

Further,

सुहृन्मित्रार्युदासीनमध्यस्थद्वेष्यबन्धुषु ।
साधुष्वपि च पापेषु समबुद्धिर्विशिष्यते ।। ९ ।।

Suhṛn-mitrāryudāsīna-madhyastha-dveṣya-bandhuṣu
Sādhuṣvapi ca pāpeṣu samabuddhir-viśiṣyate

9. He who sees equally the well-wisher, the friend, the foe, the neutral, the arbitrator, the hateful and the relative, as also the righteous and even the unrighteous, attains excellence.

He who sees equally, i.e. without considering who one is or what he does, *the well-wisher* who does a favour without expecting any service in return, *the friend* who has affection for him, *the foe* who is adverse, *the neutral* who takes no side, *the arbitrator* who wishes for the welfare of both the opposing parties, *the hateful* one who is not liked by himself, *and the relative* who is a kinsman, *as also the righteous* who follow the śāstras (scriptures), *and even the unrighteous* who engage themselves in (scripturally) prohibited acts, *attains excellence.* Another reading for "visisyate" (attains excellence) is "vimucyate" (is freed[15].)

14. Knowledge derived from scripture is indirect (*parokṣa*) while personal realisation is direct (*aparokṣa*). When through them both, the yogi's mind has reached the conviction that there is nothing more (to know or to do), he becomes unshakeable, devoid of elation, dejection, desire, anger, etc., and composed. (Ā)

15. i.e. freed from all sins.

The sense is that such a person is the best among all yogārūḍhas, those who have attained to yoga.

Wherefore, in order to attain this superlative result,

योगी युञ्जीत सततमात्मानं रहसि स्थितः ।
एकाकी यतचित्तात्मा निराशीरपरिग्रहः १० ॥

Yogī yuñjīta satatam-ātmānam rahasi sthitaḥ
Ekākī yatacitt-atma nirāśīr-aparigrahaḥ

10. The *yogi* should constantly practise concentration of mind, retiring into solitude, alone, with mind and body controlled, free from desire and possession.

The yogi, the man of meditation, *should constantly practise* concentration of mind (ātmā = antaḥ-karaṇa), *retiring into solitude* in a mountain-cave and the like, *alone*, without any assistant;—by these attributes, 'retiring into solitude' and 'alone', it is meant that he should take to saṁnyāsa, renunciation;—

With mind and body (ātmā) *controlled, free from desire*, i.e. wish, *and possession.* Even after taking to saṁnyāsa, he should practise (Dhyāna-) yoga, abandoning all possessions.

Now then, it is necessary to state what precepts a person practising (*Dhyāna-*) *yoga* should follow, as aids to it, in the matter of sitting, recreation, and the like; what the marks of the person who has attained to (that) *yoga* are; what the effects of *yoga* are; and other such matters. With this object, the Lord commences (this section). The mode of sitting, which is the first[16], is being described:

शुचौ देशे प्रतिष्ठाप्य स्थिरमासनमात्मनः ।
नात्युच्छ्रितं नातिनीचं चैलाजिनकुशोत्तरम् ॥ ११ ॥

16. In accordance with the aphorism '*āsīnas-sambhavāt*'. (*Br.Sū*-IV-1.7). (Ā)

Śucau deśe pratiṣṭhāpya sthiram-āsanam-ātmanaḥ
Nātyucchritam nātinīcam cailājina-kuśottaram

11. Having in a pure spot established his seat, firm, neither too high nor too low, with a cloth, a skin and *kuśa*-grass arranged thereon—

(The sentence is completed in the next verse.)

Having in a pure spot, either naturally faultless or made so artificially, *established his*[17] *seat,* firm, not shaky, *neither too high nor too low, with a cloth, a skin and kuśa-grass, arranged thereon*: The order in which cloth etc. are to be spread on the seat is the reverse of that mentioned in the text.[18].

Having established the seat, what is to be done?

तत्रैकाग्रं मनः कृत्वा यतचित्तेन्द्रियक्रियः ।
उपविश्यासने युञ्ज्याद्योगमात्मविशुद्धये ॥ १२ ॥

Tatraikāgram manah kṛtva yata-cittendriya-kriyaḥ
Upaviśyāsane yuñjyād-yogam-ātma-viśuddhaye

12. there, seated on the seat, making the mind one-pointed, and subduing the actions of the imagining faculty and the senses, let him practise yoga for the purification of the self.

there, seated on that seat, let him practise Yoga. How? *Making the mind one-pointed,* after withdrawing it from all sense-objects, *and subduing the actions of the imagining faculty* (' citta ") *and the senses.* Why should he practise Yoga? The answer is: *for the purification of the self,* the antah-karaṇa, the inner faculty, namely the mind.

The external seat has been described; now the posture in which the body should be held is being stated:

17. The use of another's seat is thus prohibited. (Ā)

18. i.e., *kuśa* grass immediately on the seat, (deer or tiger) skin upon the *kuśa grass* and cloth upon the skin.

समं कायशिरोग्रीवं धारयन्नचलं स्थिरः ।
संप्रेक्ष्य नासिकाग्रं स्वं दिशश्चानवलोकयन् ॥ १३ ॥

Samam kāya-śiro-grīvam dhārayann-acalam sthiraḥ
Samprekṣya nāsikāgram svam diśaścānavalokayan

13. Holding erect and still the body, head and neck, and being firm, gazing at the tip of his nose and not looking around;

(The sentence is completed in the next verse)

Holding erect and still the body, head and neck—There is the possibility of motion when holding the body etc. erect; hence the qualification 'still'.

And being firm, gazing at the tip of his nose—the word ' iva ' (as it were) has to be understood (before ' at the tip '); he is to gaze, as it were, exactly at the tip of his nose; it is not intended to lay down that the tip of the nose should be actually gazed at. What else then? The descent of the eye-sight[19] (i.e. fixing it within) is meant. And this depends on the composure of the mind. If gazing at the tip of the nose be deemed to have been prescribed, the mind would have to be concentrated there alone and not on the Self. But, as a matter of fact, in the words, "keeping the mind established in the Self" (V-25), the Lord prescribes the composure of the mind in the Self. Therefore, the word ' iva ' (as it were) being understood, the 'fixing of eye-sight within' is meant by 'gazing '.

And not looking around, without looking about this side and that, now and then.

And further,

प्रशान्तात्मा विगतभीर्ब्रह्मचारिव्रते स्थितः ।
मनः संयम्य मच्चित्तो युक्त आसीत मत्परः ॥ १४ ॥

19. (*Cakṣuṣor-dṛṣṭi-saṁnipātaḥ.*) the destitution of the faculty of eye-sight from proceeding towards its objects such as form, i.e. withdrawing it within oneself. (Ā)

Praśāntātmā vigata-bhīr-brahmacāri-vrate sthitaḥ
Manah saṁyaṁya mac-citto yukta āsita mat-paraḥ

14. Serene-minded and fearless, firm in the vow of a brahmacārin, with the mind controlled, ever thinking of Me, and steadfast, let him sit, regarding Me as the Supreme.

Serene-minded (ātmā=antaḥ-karaṇa) *and fearless, firm in the vow of a brahmacārin*, namely, service to the guru, eating the food obtained by begging, etc.; he should strictly practise these:;— and also, *with the mind controlled*, drawing in the activities of the mind, *ever thinking of Me*, the Parameśvara (Supreme Lord), *and steadfast*, composed, *let him sit, regarding Me as the Supreme*. A lover may always be thinking of a woman, but he does not hold her as supreme over all others; he regards the king or Mahādeva (the great God) as supreme. The yogi, on the other hand, ever thinks of Me and also regards, Me as the Supreme.

The fruit of *Yoga* is now stead:

युञ्जन्नेवं सदाऽऽत्मानं योगी नियतमानसः ।
शान्तिं निर्वाणपरमां मत्संस्थामधिगच्छति ॥ १५ ॥

Yuñjannevam sadā(ā)tmānam yogī niyata:mānasaḥ
Śāntim nirvāna-paramām mat-saṁsthām-adhigacchati

15. Thus always keeping himself steadfast, the yogi of subdued mind attains the Peace abiding in Me, which culminates in Nirvāṇa.

Thus, in the manner aforesaid, *always keeping himself*, (i.e. his mind) *steadfast*, composed, *the yogi of subdued mind attains the Peace abiding in Me, which culminates in Nirvāṇa*, i.e. Mokṣa.

Now follow the regulations concerning the yogi's food etc.:

नात्यश्नतस्तु योगोऽस्ति न चैकान्तमनश्नतः ।
न चाति स्वप्नशीलस्य जाग्रतो नैव चार्जुन ॥ १६ ॥

Nātyaśnatastu yogo(a)sti na caikāntam-anaśnataḥ
Na cāti svapna-śīlasya jāgrato naiva cārjuna

16. *Yoga* is not for him who eats too much, nor for him who does not eat at all, nor for him who sleeps too much, nor even for him who is (always) awake, O Arjuna.

Yoga is not for him who eats too much, that is, in excess of what is the proper measure[20] for him, *nor for him who does not eat at all.* As the Śruti says: "Whatever food is the proper measure for one, that protects and harms not. A greater quantity injures; and a smaller quantity protects not" (Śatapata Brāhmaṇa IX-ii-1, 2). Therefore, a yogi should not eat either in excess of, or less than, what is the proper quantity for him. Another interpretation is: Yoga is not for him who eats in excess of the quantity of food prescribed for a yogin in the yoga-śāstra. The quantity has been specified thus—

"Half (the stomach) for food and seasoned articles, the third (quarter) for water, the fourth (quarter) being left over for the free movement of air."

In like manner, yoga is *not for him who sleeps too much, nor even for him who is awake excessively, O* Arjuna!

How then is Yoga to be achieved? The reply is—

युक्ताहारविहारस्य युक्तचेष्टस्य कर्मसु ।
युक्तस्वप्नावबोधस्य योगो भवति दुःखहा ॥ १७ ॥

Yuktāhārā-vihārasya yukta-ceṣṭasya karamasu
Yukta-svapnāvabodhasya yogo bhavati duḥkhahā

20. Eight mouthfuls. (A)

17. To him who is moderate in eating and recreation, moderate in exertion in actions, moderate in sleep and wakefulness, *Yoga* becomes the destroyer of misery.

To him who is moderate in eating and recreation i.e. whose food and recreation, i.e. walking, are of the prescribed limits[21], *moderate in exertion in actions*[21]., *moderate in sleep and wakefulness* i.e.—in going to sleep and waking up at the prescribed periods of the night[21]—to such a yogin, *yoga becomes the destroyer of misery*; it does destroy all misery; that is to say, it brings about the destruction of the entire misery of saṁsāra.

When does he become steadfast in *Yoga*? This is being stated now:

यदा विनियतं चित्तमात्मन्येवावतिष्ठते ।
निःस्पृहः सर्वकामेभ्यो युक्त इत्युच्यते तदा ।। १८ ।।

Yadā viniyatam cittam-ātmanyevāvatiṣṭhate
Niḥspṛhaḥ sarva-kāmebhyo yukta ityucyate tadā

18. When the completely controlled mind rests in the Self alone, free from longing for all desires, then is one said to be steadfast (firmly established).

When the completely controlled mind of the yogin, well-restrained and having attained to one-pointedness, *rests in the Self alone,* having given up all external thoughts, stays in its natural state, namely the Self, which is second-less, *free from longing for all desires* for objects seen and unseen, *then,* at that time, *is one said to be steadfast*, absorbed in samādhi.

A comparison to the concentrated mind of the yoga is now mentioned:

21. He should not walk more than a yojana (8 or 8 miles); he should control his speech etc.; he should keep awake in the first third of the night, sleep during the middle third, and keep awake in the last third. (Ā)

यथा दीपो निवातस्थो नेङ्गते सोपमा स्मृता ।
योगिनो यतचित्तस्य युञ्जतो योगमात्मनः ॥ १९ ॥

Yathā dīpo nivātastho neṅgate sopamā smṛtā
Yogino yata-cittasya yuñjato yogam-ātmanaḥ

19. " As a lamp in a spot sheltered from the wind does not flicker "—this has been regarded as the simile for the subdued mind of the yogi practising *Yoga* in the Self.

"*As a lamp in a spot sheltered from the wind*, i.e. where there is no wind, *does not flicker*, is not agitated"—*this has been regarded* by those proficient in Yoga, those who have understood the behaviour of the mind (citta=the thinking faculty), *as the simile for the subdued mind of the yogi*, practising yoga concentration, *in the Self.*

Having in this manner become one-pointed, like unto the lamp in a sheltered spot, by virtue of the practice of *Yoga*—

यत्रोपरमते चित्तं निरुद्धं योगसेवया ।
यत्र चैवात्मनाऽऽत्मानं पश्यन्नात्मनि तुष्यति ॥ २० ॥

Yatroparamate cittam niruddham yoga sevayā
Yatra caivātmanā(ā)tmānam paśyannātmani tuṣyati

20. When the mind, absolutely restrained by the practice of concentration, attains quietude, and when seeing the Self by the self, one is satisfied in his own Self only;

(The sentence is completed in verse 23.)

When, at what time, *the mind, absolutely restrained*, completely warded off from the wandering about on all sides, *by the practice of concentration, attains quietude, and when*, at what time, *seeing the Self*, the Supreme Intelligence—Effulgence, *by the Self*, by the inner sense (antaḥ-karaṇa) completely purified by concentration

(samādhi), *one is satisfied*, attains contentment[22], *in his own Self only*;

and,

सुखमात्यन्तिकं यत्तद्बुद्धिग्राह्यमतीन्द्रियम् ।
वेत्ति यत्र न चैवायं स्थितश्चलति तत्त्वतः ॥ २१ ॥

Sukham-ātyantikam yat-tad-buddhi-grāhyam-atīndriyam
Vetti yatra na caivāyam sthitaś-calati tattvataḥ

21. When he knows that limitless bliss, which is perceived by the intellect and which transcends the senses, and established wherein he never moves from the Reality;

When, at what time, *he knows*, experiences, *that limitless*, that which is infinite, *bliss, which is perceived by the intellect* alone, having no need for the sense-organs, *and which transcends the senses*, which is beyond the range of the senses, not being a product of any object of sense-experience, *and established wherein*, namely the Self, *he*, the wise man, *never moves from the Reality*, i.e. never departs from his real state;

besides,

यं लब्ध्वा चापरं लाभं मन्यते नाधिकं ततः ।
यस्मिन्स्थितो न दुःखेन गुरुणाऽपि विचाल्यते ॥ २२ ॥

Yam labdhvā cāparam lābham manyate nādhikam tataḥ
Yasmin-sthito na duḥkhena guruṇā(a)pi vicālyate

22. On realising the Self directly, there is no scope for absence of satisfaction he is therefore truly 'satisfied'. (Ā)

22. and, having obtained which, (he) regards no other acquisition superior to that, and where established he is not shaken even by great sorrow;

and, having obtained which, the gain of (his true) Self, *(he) regards no other acquisition superior to that,* i.e. does not think that there is another superior to it, *and where established,* namely, in the Reality, the Self, *he is not shaken even by great sorrow,* such as caused by an attack with a weapon;

(Now is stated) the special state of the self, *Yoga,* which has been described with so many attributes in the verses beginning from "when (the mind)......attains quietude" (VI-20)—

तं विद्याद्दुःखसंयोगवियोगं योगसंज्ञितम् ।
स निश्चयेन योक्तव्यो योगोऽनिर्विण्णचेतसा ॥ २३ ॥

Tam vidyād-duḥkha-samyoga-viyogam yoga-saṁjñitaṁ

Sa niścayena yoktavyo yogo(a)nirviṇṇa-cetasā

23. let that, the severance from the contact of pain, be known as called by the name of *Yoga.* This *Yoga* should be practised with conviction and undepressed heart.

let that, the severance from the contact of pain, be known, understood, *as called by the name of Yoga,* which is an inverted description (viparīta-lakṣaṇa).

Having thus concluded the subject of the fruit of Yoga, the Lord once again speaks in another way of the necessity for practising Yoga, for the purpose of enjoining conviction and self-reliance as the means to Yoga.

This Yoga, which produces the fruits stated above, *should be practised with conviction,* firm belief,[23] *and undepressed heart.*

23. That the stated fruit of *Yoga* will accrue in this life or in the next (Ā).

Moreover,

संकल्पप्रभवान्कामांस्त्यक्त्वा सर्वानशेषतः ।
मनसैवेन्द्रियग्रामं विनियम्य समन्ततः ॥ २४ ॥

Saṁkalpa-prabhavān-kāmāṁs-tyaktvā sarvān-aśeṣataḥ
Manasaivendriya-grāam viniyamya samantataḥ

24. Abandoning without reserve all desires born of *saṁkalpa* (planning), and completely restraining the whole group of senses from all directions by the mind alone.

(The sentence is completed in the next verse.)

Abandoning without reserve, without any residue, *all desires born of saṁkalpa (planning), and*—what else?—*completely restraining the whole group of the senses from all directions by the mind alone,* possessed of discrimination.

शनैः शनैरुपरमेद्बुद्ध्या धृतिगृहीतया ।
आत्मसंस्थं मनः कृत्वा न किंचिदपि चिन्तयेत् ॥ २५ ॥

Śanaiḥ śanair-uparamed-buddhyā dhṛti-gṛhītayā
Ātma-saṁsthaṁ manaḥ kṛtvā na kiñcidapi cintayet

25. let him attain quietude by slow degrees, with intellect held by firmness; keeping the mind established in the Self, let him not think of anything.

let him attain quietude by slow degrees, not suddenly or all at once; with what?—*with the intellect held by firmness,* i.e. possessed of steadiness; *keeping the mind established in the Self,* i.e. making it abide in the Self with the thought that the Self alone is All and that nothing else exists, *let him not think of anything.*

This[24] is the supreme precept concerning Yoga.

24. Namely, the steadiness of the mind. (Ā)

Now, for the yogin who engages in making the mind thus abide in the Self—

यतो यतो निश्चरति मनश्चञ्चलमस्थिरम् ।
ततस्ततो नियम्यैतदात्मन्येव वशं नयेत् ॥ २६ ॥

Yato yato niścarati manaś-cañcalam-asthiram
Tatas-tato niyamyaitad-ātmanyeva vaśam nayet

26. Through whatever cause the restless, unsteady mind wanders away, curbing it from that, let him bring it under the control of the Self alone.

Through whatever cause, such as sound etc., *the restless*, excessively fickle, and hence *unsteady mind wanders away*, due to its inherent weakness, *curbing it from that*, restraining it from such cause as sound etc., by reducing it (the sense-object) to a phantom through an investigation of its nature, and also by cultivating indifference to the world,[25] *let him bring it*, the mind, *under the control of the Self alone*, cause it to depend on (be submissive to, i.e. abide in) the Self. Thus, by virtue of such practice of Yoga, the yogin's mind attains tranquillity (dissolution) in the Self alone.

प्रशान्तमनसं ह्येनं योगिनं सुखमुत्तमम् ।
उपैति शान्तरजसं ब्रह्मभूतमकल्मषम् ॥ २७ ॥

Praśānta-manasam hyenam yoginam sukham-uttamam
Upaiti śānta-rajasam Brahma-bhūtam-akalmaṣam

27. Verily, supreme bliss comes to this yogi of tranquil mind, (who is) passion-quieted, Brahman-become, and freed from taint.

25. This process is the practice of *viveka* (discrimination) and *vairāgya* (dispassion).

Verily, supreme, unexcelled, *bliss comes to this yogi, of tranquil mind*, (*who is*) *passion-quieted*, from whom passion (rajas) i.e. infatuation and other causes of suffering, have vanished, *Brahman-become*, who has become a jīvan-mukta, liberated while in the body. having the conviction (realisation) that all is Brahman, *and freed from taint*, who is not affected by adharma and dharma.

युञ्जन्नेवं सदाऽऽत्मानं योगी विगतकल्मषः ।
सुखेन ब्रह्मसंस्पर्शमत्यन्तं सुखमश्नुते ॥ २८ ॥

Yuñjann-evam sadā(ā)tmānam yogī vigata-kalmaṣaḥ

Sukhena Brahma-saṁsparśam-atyantam sukham-aśnute

28. Constantly engaging himself thus, the yogi freed from taint attains with ease to the infinite bliss of contact with Brahman.

Constantly engaging himself thus, always engaging the mind in the manner aforesaid, and quitted of all obstacles to *Yoga*., *the yogi freed from taint*, evil, *attains with ease*, without difficulty *to the infinite bliss*, the bliss that is beyond limit, superlative, unexcelled, of *contact with Brahman*[26], the Supreme.

Now, the effect of Yoga, the perfection of identity with Brahman, which brings about the cessation of all *saṁsāra*, is being described.

सर्वभूतस्थमात्मानं सर्वभूतानि चात्मनि ।
ईक्षते योगयुक्तात्मा सर्वत्र समदर्शनः ॥ २९ ॥

Sarva-bhūtastham-ātmānam sarva-bhūtāni cātmani

Ikṣate yoga-yuktātmā sarvatra sama-darśanaḥ

26. i.e., sameness of nature (*tadatmya*); being of the same essence (*aikarsaya*) as Brahman. (Ā)

29. With the self concentrated by *Yoga*, seeing the same everywhere, he beholds the Self abiding in all beings, and all beings in the Self.

With the self (ātmā=antaḥ-karaṇa) *concentrated by Yoga, seeing the same everywhere,* possessed of the cognition of the identity of Brahman and the Self, and seeing this identity equally, without any distinction, in all the different beings from Brahmā (the Creator) down to inanimate objects—*he beholds the Self,* his own Self, *abiding in all beings and all beings in the Self,* all beings from Brahmā down to a clump of grass as one with the Self.

The consequence of this perception of the unity of the Self is now stated:—

यो मां पश्यति सर्वत्र सर्वं च मयि पश्यति।
तस्याहं न प्रणश्यामि स च मे न प्रणश्यति ॥ ३० ॥

Yo mām paśyati sarvatra sarvam ca mayi paśyati
Tasyāham na praṇaśyāmi sa ca me na praṇaśyatii

30. He who sees Me everywhere, and sees all things in Me, I do not disappear (i.e. get lost) for him, nor does he disappear (i.e. get lost) for Me.

He who sees Me, Vāsudeva, the Self of all, *everywhere,* in all beings, *and sees all things,* the whole aggregate of beings beginning from Brahmā, *in Me,* the Self of all,—*I do not disappear for him,* for such a seer of the unity of the Self, I, Īśvara, do not go out of his vision; *nor does he,* that wise man, *disappear for Me,* leave My, Vāsudeva's vision; for, he and I are the same Self. And, verily, one's own Self is nothing but ever-present to him. Wherefore he who beholds the unity of the Self in all is Myself.

Referring to the Plenary Knowledge which is the purport of the preceding verse, the Lord asserts its effect to be Mokṣa.

सर्वभूतस्थितं यो मां भजत्येकत्वमास्थितः ।
सर्वथा वर्तमानोऽपि स योगी मयि वर्तते ॥ ३१ ॥

Sarva-bhūta-sthitam yo mām bhajatyekatvam-āsthitaḥ
Sarvathā vartamāno (a)pi sa yogī mayi vartate

31. He who, having been established in unity, adores Me dwelling in all beings, whatever his mode of life, that yogi abides in Me.

He who, having been established in unity, adores (*worships*) *Me dwelling in all beings, whatever his made of life*, though living in any manner[27], *that yogi*, the man of Plenary Wisdom, *abides in Me*, in the state of Viṣṇu, the supreme (state): that is to say, he is ever-free; and nothing hinders him as regards Mokṣa[28].

Moreover,

आत्मौपम्येन सर्वत्र समं पश्यति योऽर्जुन ।
सुखं वा यदि वा दुःखं स योगी परमो मतः ॥ ३२ ॥

Ātmaupamyena sarvatra samam paśyāti yo(a)rjuna
Sukham vā yadi vā duḥkham sa yogī paramo mataḥ

32. He who looks upon pleasure or pain everywhere by the same standard as for himself, that yogi, O Arjuna, is regarded as the highest.

O Arjuna, he who looks upon pleasure or pain everywhere by the same standard as for himself—[' Or ' (" vā ") is here used in the sense of ' and ' (" ca ")]—By comparison with himself, he

27. In the yogi, devoid of passion and purified by *yama* and *niyama*, etc., there can be no wanton behaviour; yet, the Lord speaks in this manner for extolling the yogi's wisdom. (Ā)

28. This answers the possible doubt that the apparent misconduct of the man of wisdom might act as an obstacle with regard to his remaining ever-free. (Ā)

regards pleasure and pain with regard to all beings, identically. "Just as the pleasant is dear to me, in the same way is the pleasant favourable to all beings; and just as the painful is unfavourable and undesirable for me, in the same way is the painful undesirable and adverse to all beings"—thus he sees, by his own standard, pleasure and pain as favourable and unfavourable, equally for all beings alike; that is to say, he does not behave adversely towards anybody; he is harmless.

That yogi, who is harmless and established in Plenary Knowledge in the manner stated, *is regarded as the highest* among all yogins.

Considering that the Yoga, described above whose characteristic is Plenary Knowledge , is hard to acquire, and desirous of learning the certain means to its attainment.

अर्जुन उवाच—

योऽयं योगस्त्वया प्रोक्तः साम्येन मधुसूदन ।
एतस्याहं न पश्यामि चञ्चलत्वात्स्थितिं स्थिराम् ॥ ३३ ॥

Arjuna uvāca—

Yo(a)yam yogas-tvāya proktaḥ sāṁyena Madhusūdana

Etasyāham na paśyāmi cañcalatvāt-sthitim sthirām

Arjuna said—

33. (Of this *Yoga* which has been taught by Thee, O slayer of Madhu, as characterised by even-ness, I do not see its lasting endurance, owing to restlessness.

O slayer of Madhu! Of this yoga which has been taught by Thee, as characterised by even-ness, equanimity (perception of identity), *I do not see,* understand, *its,* this yoga's, *lasting endurance,* permanent continuance, *owing to the restlessness* of the mind as is well-known.

चञ्चलं हि मनः कृष्ण प्रमाथि बलवद्दृढम् ।
तस्याहं निग्रहं मन्ये वायोरिव सुदुष्करम् ॥ ३४ ॥

Cañcalam hi manaḥ Kṛṣṇa pramāthi balavad-dṛḍham

Tasyāham nigraham manye vāyor-iva suduṣkaram

34. Verily, the mind, O Kṛṣṇa is restless, turbulent, strong and tough. I regard its control quite as hard to achieve as that of the wind.

O Kṛṣṇa: 'Krsna' is derived from the root 'kṛṣ', 'to scrape'. Kṛṣṇa is so called, because he scrapes or draws away all sins and other evils from His devotees.

Verily, the mind is restless. Not merely is it restless; it is also *turbulent*, capable of agitating: it agitates the body and the senses, distracts them and subjects them (to outside influences). Besides, it is *strong*, incapable of being checked by any means, being invincible; and moreover, it is *tough*, impossible of being cut, as is the "tantunāga[29]". *I regard its control*, the restraint of the mind of such a nature, *quite as hard to achieve as that of the wind*: the sense is that, difficult as it is to control the wind, the restraint of the mind is even more difficult.

The Lord says: So it is, as you say.

श्री भगवानुवाच—
असंशयं महाबाहो मनो दुर्निग्रहं चलम् ।
अभ्यासेन तु कौन्तेय वैराग्येण च गृह्यते ॥ ३५ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Asamśayam mahābāho mamo durnigraham calam
Abhyāsena tu Kaunteya vairagyeṇa ca gṛhyate

29. Known as *varuṇa-pāśa*, a large shark, which, being very tough, is impossible of being cut. (Ā)

The Blessed Lord said—

35. Without doubt, O mighty-armed, the mind is difficult to control, and restless; but, through practice and rununciation, O son of Kuntī, it may be governed.

O mighty-armed! *Without doubt*—there is no doubt in this, that *the mind is difficult to control, and restless*; *but through practice*, i.e. the constant repetition in the mental field of the same idea with reference to some single object of thought, *and renunciation*, the absence of desire for objects of pleasurable enjoyment, seen and unseen, which is achieved by the constant perception of evil in them, *O son of Kunti*, it, i.e., "vikṣepa", the distracted movement of thought, *may be governed.* In this way, the mind is governed, kept in check, restrained.

But, as regards him of uncontrolled self—

असंयतात्मना योगो दुष्प्राप इति मे मतिः ।
वश्यात्मना तु यतता शक्योऽवाप्तुमुपायतः ॥ ३६ ॥

Asamyatātmanā yogo duṣprāpa iti me matiḥ
Vaśyātmanā tu yatatā śakyo(a)vāptum-upāyataḥ

36. *Yoga* is hard to be attained by one of uncontrolled self; such is my conviction. But, by him who strives, self-controlled, it can be achieved by (proper) means.

Yoga is hard to be attained, is secured with great difficulty, *by one of uncontrolled self*, by him whose internal organ (antahkaraṇa) is not controlled through 'practice' and 'renunciation'; *such is my conviction.* But, on the other hand, *by him who strives* again and again, *self-controlled*, with the mind (ātmā) brought under control through 'practice' and 'renunciation', *it*, Yoga, *can be achieved by* the proper *means* aforesaid[30].

30. Namely, restraint of the mind through renunciation and practice. (Ā)

On (i.e. at the stage of) taking to the practice of *Yoga*, works which lead to (enjoyment of) this world and the next have been given up, even though the result of perfection in *Yoga*, namely, Plenary Knowledge, the means to mokṣa, has not been attained[31]; and so circumstanced, with his mind drawn away from the path of *Yoga* at the time of death (while he is yet in this intermediate state itself), the yogin may be ruined. Thus doubting, Arjuna said:

अर्जुन उवाच—
अयतिः श्रद्धयोपेतो योगाच्चलितमानसः ।
अप्राप्य योगसंसिद्धिं कां गतिं कृष्ण गच्छति ॥ ३७ ॥

Arjuna uvāca—

Ayatiḥ śraddhayopeto yogāc-calita-mānasaḥ

Aprāpaya yoga-saṁsiddhim kām gatim Kṛṣṇa gacchati

Arjuna said—

37. He who is possessed of *śraddhā* but does not strive, with the mind wandering away from *Yoga*, what end does he meet, O Kṛṣṇa, having failed to gain perfection in *Yoga?*

He who is possed of śraddhā, faith (in the efficacy of Yoga), *but does not strive* in the path of Yoga, *with the mind wandering away from Yoga* at the time of death, deprived of his understanding[32], *what end does he meet, O Kṛṣṇa, having failed to gain perfection in Yoga*, namely Plenary Knowledge, the fruition of Yoga?

31. Since the practice of *Yoga* is beset with many impediments, perfection in *Yoga* is generally not attained in a single life-time. (Ā)

32. Because the senses will be distracted at the time of death, he will not be able to remain in his practice of *Yoga*. (Ā)

कच्चिन्नोभयविभ्रष्टश्छिन्नाभ्रमिव नश्यति ।
अप्रतिष्ठो महाबाहो विमूढो ब्रह्मणः पथि ॥ ३८ ॥

Kaccinnobhaya-vibhraṣṭaś-chinnābhram-iva naśyati
Apratiṣṭho mahābāho vimūḍho Brahmaṇaḥ pathi

38. Does he not, fallen from both, perish, like a rent cloud, without support, O Mighty-armed, deluded in the path to Brahman?

Does he not, fallen from both Karma-mārga (the path of Action) and Yoga-mārga (the path of Yoga), *perish, like a rent cloud, without support*, without anything to rest upon, O Mighty-armed, *deluded in the path to Brahman*, the path by which Brahman can be attained? Or, will he not perish (or, is it that he will not perish)?

एतन्मे संशयं कृष्ण छेत्तुमर्हस्यशेषतः ।
त्वदन्यः संशयस्यास्य छेत्ता न ह्युपपद्यते ॥ ३९ ॥

Etan-me samiśayam Kṛṣṇa chettum-arhaśyaśeṣataḥ
Tvadanyaḥ samśayasyāsya chettā na hyupapadyate

39. This doubt of mine, O Kṛṣṇa, Thou art fit to (i.e. Thou shouldst) completely dispel; for none other than Thyself can possibly dispel this doubt.

This doubt of mine, O Kṛṣṇa Thou shouldst completely dispel, remove; for *none other than Thyself*, either ṛṣi or god, *can possibly dispel this doubt*; therefore. Thou alone must remove this doubt.

श्रीभगवानुवाच—
पार्थ नैवेह नामुत्र विनाशस्तस्य विद्यते ।
न हि कल्याणकृत्कश्चिद्दुर्गतिं तात गच्छति ॥ ४० ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Pārtha naiveha nāmutra vināśas-tasya vidyate
Na hi kalyāṇakṛi kaścid-durgatim tāta gacchati

The Blessed Lord said—

40. O Pārtha, surely there is no destruction for him either here or hereafter; for, verily, O My son, the doer of good never comes to grief.

O Pārtha, surely there is no destruction for him either here, in this world, *or* hereafter, in the next world. The man who has fallen in Yoga will not get ruined, i.e. a lower birth than the earlier (the present) one. *For, verily, the doer of good,* that which is auspicious, virtuous, *never comes to frief*: he will not fall into a despicable condition, *O My son.* The father is called 'tāta', because he produces (from 'tan', to produce) himself in the form of a son. As the father himself is thus the son, the son also is called 'tāta'. The disciple also (being in the position of a son) is addressed as the son.

What, then, does happen to him?

प्राप्य पुण्यकृतां लोकानुषित्वा शाश्वतीः समाः ।
शुचीनां श्रीमतां गेहे योगभ्रष्टोऽभिजायते ॥ ४१ ॥

Prāpya puṇyakṛtām lokān-uṣitvā śāśvatīḥ samāḥ
Śucīnām śrīmatām gehe yoga-bhraṣṭo(a)bhijāyate

41. Having attained to the worlds of the righteous and having dwelt (there) for everlasting years, he who has fallen in *Yoga* takes birth in the home of the pure and the prosperous.

Having attained to the worlds of the righteous, those who have performed sacrifices such as the "aśva-medha", *and having dwelt,*

enjoyed residence, there *for ever-lasting*, eternal[33], *years, he who has fallen in Yoga*, on the termination of the enjoyment (of residence in those worlds), *takes birth in the home of the pure*, those who act in the manner prescribed (in the śāstras), *and the prosperous*, those endowed with plenty. From the context, this refers to the saṁnyāsin[34] who has taken to the path of Yoga (i.e. Dhyāna-Yoga).

अथवा योगिनामेव कुले भवति धीमताम् ।
एतद्धि दुर्लभतरं लोके जन्म यदीदृशम् ॥ ४२ ॥

Athavā yoginām-eva kule bhavati dhīmatām
Etadd-hi durlabha-taram loke jamma yadīdṛsam

42. Or else, he is indeed born into a family or wise yogins; verily, a birth such as this is very rare to obtain in this world.

Or else, he is indeed born into a family of wise yogins—that of (materially) poor yogins endowed with knowledge,[35] different from a family of the prosperous. *Verily, a birth such as this*, into a family of yogins, *is very rare to obtain in this world*: birth in a family of this kind is more difficult to get than in that mentioned previously.

Because.

तत्र तं बुद्धिसंयोगं लभते पौर्वदेहिकम् ।
यतते च ततो भूयः संसिद्धौ कुरुनन्दन ॥ ४३ ॥

Tatra tam buddhi-saṁyogam labhate paurva-
dehikam
Yatate ca tato bhūyaḥ saṁsiddhau Kuru-nandana

33. By way of distinction from the years of the human (Ā)--thus' not absolutely eternal, but only very long.

34. See discussion in the introduction at the beginning of this Chapter.

35. *Brahmā-vidyā* (Science of the Absolute). (Ā)

43. There he is united with the intelligence acquired in his previous body, and strives, more than before, for perfection, O son of the Kurus.

O son of the Kurus, there, in the family of yogins, *he is united with the intelligence*[36] *acquired in his previous body, and strives, more than before, for perfection*: he makes effort[37], more perfect than in the previous birth, for attaining final beautitude.

How he gets united with the intelligence acquired in his previous body is now stated—

पूर्वाभ्यासेन तेनैव ह्रियते ह्यवशोऽपि सः ।
जिज्ञासुरपि योगस्य शब्दब्रह्मातिवर्तते ॥ ४४ ॥

Purvābhyāsena tenaiva hriyate hyavaśo(a)pi saḥ
Jijñāsur-api yogasya Śabda-brahmātivartate

44. By that very previous practice, he is verily borne on, even in spite of himself. Even the enquirer after *Yoga* goes beyond the Word-Brahman.

By that very previous practice, by the strong force of the practice made in the previous birth, *he* who has fallen in Yoga, (and is now reborn in the family of yogins), *is borne on, even in spite of himself*. If he had not done any act of an unrighteous nature (adharma) strong enough to overpower the impress made by the practice of Yoga, then he is carried on by the impress produced by the practice of Yoga. On the other hand, if adharma be the stronger, even the impress caused by Yoga is certainly overpowered by that (adharma); but, when the effect of the adharma has been exhausted, the impress caused by Yoga begins to produce its effects: even though it has remained (inoperative) for a long time, it does not get destroyed—that is the meaning.

Even the enquirer after Yoga, even the person who entered on the path of Yoga with a view to understanding its (Yoga's)

36. Knowledge concerning the Self. (Ā)
37. Engaging in *Śravaṇa* etc. (Ā)

nature, namely, the saṁnyāsin who had fallen in Yoga, as the context shows, *goes beyond*, discards, *the Word-Brahman*, the fruit of the performance of actions prescribed by Veda. How much more would he who understands Yoga and, with steadfast devotion, practices it!

And, for what reason is being a yogin regarded as excellent?

प्रयत्नाद्यतमानस्तु योगी संशुद्धकिल्बिषः ।
अनेकजन्मसंसिद्धस्ततो याति पराङ्गतिम् ॥ ४५ ॥

Prayatnād-yatamānastu yogī samśuddha-kilbiṣaḥ
Aneka-janma-saṁsiddhas-tato yāti parāṁ-gatim

45. The yogi, striving with assiduity, purified of taint, gaining perfection through many births, then reaches the highest goal.

The Yogi, the enlightened man, *striving with assiduity*, putting forth greater (and greater) effort, *purified of taint*, cleansed of sins, *gaining perfection through many births*, increasing the fund of the impress of Yoga little by little in the course of several births, and, through the aggregate of the impress accumulated in many births, having reached perfection, and *then*, having thereby become possessed of Plenary Wisdom, *reaches the highest*, the most exalted *goal*.

For this reason, therefore,

तपस्विभ्योऽधिको योगी ज्ञानिभ्योऽपि मतोऽधिकः ।
कर्मिभ्यश्चाधिको योगी तस्माद्योगी भवार्जुन ॥ ४६

Tapasvibhyo(a)dhiko yogī jñānibhyo(a)pi
mato(a)dhikaḥ
Karmibhyaścādhiko yogī tasmād-yogī bhavārjuna

46. The yogi is regarded as superior to those who practise asceticism, as also the those who have obtained

knowledge; he is also superior to the men of action. Therefore, do you become a yogi, O Arjuna.

The yogi is regarded as superior to those who practise asceticism, as also to those who have obtained knowledge, which here refers to erudition in the Śāstras; *he is also superior to the men of action,* those who perform "agnihotra" and other works. *Therefore, do you become a yogi, O Arjuna.*

योगिनामपि सर्वेषां मद्गतेनान्तरात्मना ।
श्रद्धावान्भजते यो मां स मे युक्ततमो मतः ॥ ४७ ॥

Yoginām-api sarveṣām mad-gatenāntarātmanā
Śraddhāvān-bhajate yo mām sa me yukta-tamo mataḥ

47. And, of all yogis, he, who with the inner self merged in Me, who with *śraddhā* (Trust) devotes himself to Me, is considered by Me, the most steadfast.

And, of all yogis, among those who devote themselves to the meditation of Rudra, Āditya, etc., *he, who with the inner self,* antaḥ-karaṇa *merged in Me,* composed in Me, Vāsudeva[38], *who with śraddha devotes himself to Me,* resorts to Me, *is considered by Me,* accepted by Me, *as the most steadfast,* pre-eminently absorbed.

इति श्रीमहाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्यां
भीष्मपर्वणि श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु
ब्रह्मविद्यायां योगशास्त्रे श्रीकृष्णार्जुन-
संवादे ध्यानयोगो नाम
षष्ठोऽध्यायः ॥

38. The All-pervading Effulgence (Bhagavan in His *nirguna,* "attributeless" aspect), or Bhagavan in His *saguna,* "with-attributes", aspect. (A)

Iti Śrī-Mahābhārate śata-sāhasryām samhitāyām Vaiyāsikyām Bhīṣma-Parvaṇi Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītāsūpaniṣatsu Brahma-vidyāyām yoga-śāstre Śrī Kṛṣṇārjuna-samvāde Dhyāna-yoga nāma ṣaṣṭho(a)dhyāyaḥ

Thus the sixth chapter entitled 'Way of Meditation'[39] in the Upaniṣads known as 'The Celebrated Songs of the Lord' expounding the knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna—embodied in the Bhīṣma-Parva of Śrī Mahābhārata, the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyāsa.

39. The name of this chapter according to the *Bhāṣya* is *Abyāsa-yoga,* "The Way of Practice".

॥ सप्तमोऽध्यायः ॥
(ज्ञानविज्ञानयोगः)

SAPTAMO(A)DHYAYAḤ

JÑANA-VIJÑANA-YOGAḤ

CHAPTER - VII

(WAY OF KNOWLEDGE WITH REALISATION)

" And of all yogis, he, who with the inner self merged in Me, who with *śraddhā* devotes himself to Me, is considered by Me the most steadfast" (VI-47)—having in this verse set out the occasion for further inquiry, and, of his own accord, wishing to explain, "thus is My real nature; thus is the person who has his inner self merged in Me"—

श्री भगवानुवाच—

मय्यासक्तमनाः पार्थ योगं युञ्जन्मदाश्रयः ।
असंशयं समग्रं मां यथा ज्ञास्यसि तच्छृणु ॥ १ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Mayyāsakta-manāḥ Pārtha yogam yuñjan-madāśrayaḥ

Asaṁśayam samagram mām yatha jñāsyasi tacchṛṇu

The Blessed Lord said—

1. With the mind intent on Me, O Pārtha, practising *Yoga*, taking refuge in Me, how you shall without doubt know Me fully, that do you hear.

With the mind intent on Me, Parameśvara, the Supreme Lord possessing the attitude which will be mentioned, *O Pārtha, practising Yoga*, engaged in steadying the mind, *taking refuge in Me*, having Me, the Supreme Lord, alone as the resort,—

He who desires anything by way of an object of human endeavour (puruṣārtha) betakes himself to the appropriate means for its attainment, namely, activities such as Agnihotra, austerity, making gifts, or the like, as his resort. The yogi, on the other hand, betakes himself to Me alone as his resort, discarding all other means, with his mind intent on Me alone.

You also, becoming one such, *how you shall without doubt know Me*, know that "the Lord is thus (of this nature) alone", without any shadow of doubt, *fully*, i.e. as possessing infinite greatness, strength, power, supremacy, and the like, *that do you hear*, which is being presently told by Me.

And that (Knowledge) which concerns Me—

ज्ञानं तेऽहं सविज्ञानमिदं वक्ष्याम्यशेषतः ।
यज्ज्ञात्वा नेह भूयोऽन्यज्ज्ञातव्यमवशिष्यते ॥ २ ॥

Jñānam te(a)ham savijñānam-idam vakṣyāmyaśeṣataḥ

Yaj-jñātvā neha bhūyo(a)nyaj-jñātavyam-avaśiṣyate

2. I shall tell you in full, of this Knowledge, combined with experience, knowing which nothing more here remains to be known.

I shall tell you in full, in its entirety, *of this Knowledge, combined with experience*, how it is personally realised. With a view to directing the interest of the listener towards it, the Lord now extols the Knowledge which He is going to teach:—*knowing which* Knowledge, *nothing more here remains to be known*, as means to a human end (puruṣārtha). The sense is: he who knows My true being becomes all-knowing.

Thus, being productive of the superlative result, Knowledge is hard to obtain.

How (it is difficult to obtain) is told:

मनुष्याणां सहस्रेषु कश्चिद्यतति सिद्धये ।
यततामपि सिद्धानां कश्चिन्मां वेत्ति तत्त्वतः ॥ ३ ॥

Manuṣyānām sahasreṣu kaścid-yatati siddhaye

Yatātam-api siddhānām kaścin-mām vetti tattvataḥ.

3. Hardly one among thousands of men strives for perfection; even among the inspired, striving thus, (only) some rare person knows Me in reality.

Hardly one among thousands of men, i.e. many, *strives*, makes effort, *for* attaining *perfection*; *even among the inspired, striving thus*—they, who strive for liberation (mokṣa), are in truth inspired persons, *some rare person* alone *knows Me in reality*, properly.[1]

Having made the listener look forward (to the teaching) by inducing in him a relish for it, the Lord proceeds:

भूमिरापोऽनलो वायुः खं मनो बुद्धिरेव च ।
अहंकार इतीयं मे भिन्ना प्रकृतिरष्टधा ॥ ४ ॥

Bhūmir-āpo(a)nalo vāyuḥ kham mano buddhir-eva ca

Ahaṁkāra itīyam me bhinnā prakṛtir-aṣṭadhā

4. Earth, water, fire, air, ether, mind, intellect, and egoism—thus, is this, My *Prakṛti* (*Nature*,) divided eightfold.

1. The inspired persons (*siddhas*) strive for perfection, i.e., for the advent of Knowledge (*jñānotpatti*) through the purification of the mind; and Knowledge does not arise easily for each and all of them. (Ā)

Earth, stands for the 'tan-mātra'[2] of Prthivi, and not for the gross earth, because of the statement, 'My Prakrti divided eightfold'. In the same way, *water, fire, air, and ether*, also stand for the respective 'tan-matras' only; *mind*, stands for egoism 'ahaṁkāra' which is its cause; *intellect*, (stands) for the principle Mahat[3] which originates Ahamkāra; and *egoism*, for the Avyakta, the Un-manifest, conjoined to Avidyā or nescience. Just as food mixed with poison is itself called poison, Avyakta, the Prime Cause, having in it the latent impression (vāsanā) of Ahaṁkāra, is itself here called Ahaṁkāra, since the latter induces it to function. In fact, it is Ahaṁkāra alone which is seen in this world to be the impelling cause of the activity of all beings. Thus, as above-stated, *is this, My Prakṛti*, the Māyā-śakti, belonging to Īśvara (the Lord), got *divided eight-fold.*

भूमिरापोऽनलो वायुः खं मनो बुद्धिरेव च ।
अहंकार इतीयं मे भिन्ना प्रकृतिरष्टधा ॥ ४ ॥

Apareyam-itastvanyām prakṛtim viddhi me parām
Jiva-bhūtām mahābaho yayedam dhāryate jagat

5. O mighty-armed, this is the lower (Prakṛti). But different from this, know My higher Prakṛti, (which is) the principle of self-consciousness, by which this universe is upheld.

O mighty-armed, this is the lower (Prakṛti), not superior; base, impure, productive of evil, being the bondage of saṁsāra. *But different from this*, the aforesaid, *know My higher Prakṛti*, the pure and superior one, which is My every Self—*the principle*

2. '*Tan-mātra*' ('that-ness alone') denotes a subtle and primary 'element'. The 'elements' are those of *śabda* (sound), *sparśa* (touch), *rūpa* (form), *rasa* (taste) and *gandha* (smell); and they originate from the *tāmasic* aspect of *ahaṁkāra*. The *tan-mātras* produce the five 'mahā-bhūtas' (usually translated as 'great elements'), namely, *ākāśa* (ether), *vāyu* (air), *tejas* (fire), *ap* (water) and *prthivi* (earth). The *mahā-bhūtas*, in their subtle form, are not comprehensible to the sense-organs; they therefore get transformed, by a process known as *pañci-karaṇa*, into the gross state, when they become the objects of the five sense-organs (ear, skin, eye, tongue, and nose, respectively).

3. *Hiraṇya-garbha*, the Aggregate-Intellect (*samaṣṭi-buddhi*). (A)

of self-consciousness, in the form of the "Kṣetrajña[4]", that which is the cause of the sustenance of life, *by which* Prakṛti *this universe is upheld*, having been entered into by that (Prakṛti).

एतद्योनीनि भूतानि सर्वाणीत्युपधारय ।
अहं कृत्स्नस्य जगतः प्रभवः प्रलयस्तथा ॥ ६ ॥

Etad-yonīni bhūtāni sarvāṇītyupadhāraya

Aham kṛtsnasya jagataḥ prabhavaḥ pralayas-tathā

6. Know that all beings have their birth in these. I am the source, and the dissolution as well, of the whole universe.

Know that all beings have their birth in these, that these two, My lower and My higher Prakṛtis, constituting the "Kṣetra[4]" and the "Kṣetrajña" (*respectively*), are the womb of all beings. Because My two Natures (Prakṛtis) are the womb, the cause, of all beings, therefore, *I am the source*, origin, *and the dissolution*, destruction, *as well, of the whole universe*: that is to say, I, the omniscient Īśvara, am the cause of the universe, through the two Natures.

Wherefore,

मत्तः परतरं नान्यत्किंचिदस्ति धनञ्जय ।
मयि सर्वमिदं प्रोतं सूत्रे मणिगणा इव ॥ ७ ॥

Mattaḥ-parataram nānyat-kiñcid-asti Dhañanjaya

Mayi sarvam-idam protam sūtre maṇi gaṇā iva

4. *Kṣetra* is the body as the field of the working of the soul. *Kṣetrajña* is the soul, and in the *Gita* often denotes the Realised Soul, who has the true knowledge of *Kṣetra*. Of these much more later.

7. Beyond Me, O Dhanañyaja, there is nought else. All this is strung in Me as a collection of gems on a thread.

Beyond Me, the Supreme Lord (Parameśvara), *there is nought else*, there exists no other cause; I alone am the cause of the universe) *O Dhanañjaya.* Because it is thus, therefore, *in Me*, Parameśvara, *all this*, all beings, the universe, *is strung*, woven together, connected, tied together, as a cloth in its warp, and *as a collection of gems on a thread.*

"By what attributes distinguishing Thee is all this strung on Thee?"

The reply follows:

रसोऽहमप्सु कौन्तेय प्रभास्मि शशिसूर्ययोः ।
प्रणवः सर्ववेदेषु शब्दः खे पौरुषं नृषु ॥ ८ ॥

Raso(a)ham-apsu Kaunteya prabhāsmi śaśi-sūryayoḥ

Praṇavaḥ sarva-vedeṣu śabdaḥ khe pauruṣam nṛṣu

8. I am the sapidity in waters, O son of Kuntī. I am the radiance in the moon and the sun, the Praṇava in all the Vedas, sound in the ether, and man-hood in mankind.

I am the sapidity in waters:—that which is the essence in waters is sapidity; in Me, who am that sapidity, waters are woven. Similarly in all cases. Just as I am the sapidity in waters, so *I am the radiance in the moon and the sum*; *the Pravṇava,* the syllable Om, *in all the Vedas*; in Me who am that Praṇava are all the Vedas woven. So also, I am *sound in the ether,* the "ākāśa"; sound is its (ether's) essence, and in Me who am that (essence) is ether woven. *And* similarly, *I am man-hood in mankind*:—That inherent property in man which produces the idea that he is a human being is 'man-hood'; in Me who am that are human beings woven.

पुण्यो गन्धः पृथिव्यां च तेजश्चास्मि विभावसौ ।
जीवनं सर्वभूतेषु तपश्चास्मि तपस्विषु ॥ ९ ॥

Puṇyo gandhaḥ pṛthivyām ca tejaścāsmi vibhāvasau
Jīvanam sarva-bhūteṣu tapaścāsmi tapasviṣu

9. I am the sweet fragrance in the earth, and the brilliance in fire am I; the life in all beings, and the austerity in ascetics am I.

I am the sweet fragrance in the earth: its aggreeable odour; in Me who am that odour is the earth woven. Odour is by nature agreeable. The agreeableness spoken of with reference to the earth is by implication applicable to the sapidity in waters, etc. Disagreeableness of odour in the earth, and of the like, brought about by the combination of different elements, is because of the avidyā and adharma of transmigrating souls[5].

And the brilliance, lustre *in fire*, Agni, *am I*. So also, *the life in all beings*, that by which all beings live, the vital energy; *and the austerity in ascetics am I*: in Me, that austerity, are ascetics woven.

बीजं मां सर्वभूतानां विद्धि पार्थ सनातनम् ।
बुद्धिर्बुद्धिमतामस्मि तेजस्तेजस्विनामहम् ॥ १० ॥

Bījam mām sarva-bhūtānam viddhi Pārtha sanātanam
Buddhir-buddhimatām-asmi tejas-tejasvinām-aham

10. Know Me, O Pārtha, as the eternal seed of all beings. I am the intellect of the intelligent and the heroism of the heroic.

5. 'Odour' etc. in their primary forms are verily agreeable (and sacred) since they are objects of enjoyment by Siddhas and their like. But when they (odour, etc.) get transformed in combination with their own effects (the elements), they become disagreeable to ordinary living beings, owing to the evil (sin) in those beings. (Ā)

Vnow, Me, O Partha, as the eternal, ancient, *seed,* cause for the germination, *of all beings.* Besides, *I am the intellect,* the discriminative capacity of the inner-sense (antah-karana) *of the intelligent,* those who have that discriminative power, *and the heroism,* the boldness, *of the heroic,* those that have it.

बलं बलवतां चाहं कामरागविवर्जितम् ।
धर्माविरुद्धो भूतेषु कामोऽस्मि भरतर्षभ ॥ ११ ॥

Balam balavatām cāham kāma-rāga-vivarjitam
Dharmāviruddho bhūteṣu kamo(a)smi
Bharatarṣabha

11. And of the strong. I am the strength, devoid of desire and attachment. O bull among the Bhāratas, in all beings, I am desire, unopposed to Dharma.

And of the strong, I am the strength, power, energy, *devoid of desire and attachment.* Desire is the hankering after objects not present (to the senses); and attachment is the love for objects which have been met with. I am the strength which is necessary for just the maintenance of the body, and not that which brings about desire and attachment in worldy men. Moreover, *in all beings, I am desire, unopposed to Dharma,* not opposed to the precepts of scriptures,—as for instance, the desire with regard to food and drink etc. for the bare sustenance of the body, *O bull among the Bhāratas.*

Further,

ये चैव सात्त्विका भावा राजसास्तामसाश्च ये ।
मत्त एवेति तान्विद्धि न त्वहं तेषु ते मयि ॥ १२ ॥

Ye caiva sāttvikā bhāvā rājasas-tāmasāśca ye
Matta eveti tān-viddhi na tvaham teṣu te mayi

12. And whatever entities are of *Sattva* or of *Rajas* or of *Tamas,* know them to proceed from Me alone.

Nevertheless, I am not in them, (but) they are in Me.

And whatever entities are formed *of Sattva or of Rajas or of Tamas*, produced (in the three classes) as a result of the peculiar karma of living beings, *know them* all in their entirety *to proceed from Me alone.* Even though they proceed from Me, *nevertheless I am not in them*: I am not dependent on or subject to them, as mortals (saṁsārins) are; *but*, on the other hand, *they are in Me*, they are subject to Me and are dependent on Me.

The Lord (now) expresses pity that the world does not understand Him, even though He is the Supreme Lord as described above, Eternal Pure, Wise, and Free by nature, the Self of all beings, devoid of attributes, the Source which burns up the seed of the evil that is *saṁsāra*. And He proceeds to state the reason for this ignorance on the part of the world—

त्रिभिर्गुणमयैर्भावैरेभिः सर्वमिदं जगत् ।
मोहितं नाभिजानाति मामेभ्यः परमव्ययम् ॥ १३ ॥

Tribhir-guṇamayair-bhāvair-ebhiḥ sarvam-idam jagat

Mohitam nābhijānāti mām-ebhyaḥ param-avyayam

13. Deluded by these three-fold entities evolved from *guṇas*, this entire world does not know Me, (who stand) beyond them and immutable.

Deluded, fallen into ignorance, want of discrimination, *by these* aforesaid *three-fold entities evolved from gunas*, through such emotions as attachment, hatred and infatuation, *this entire*, the whole *world* of living beings, *does not know Me*, who stand *beyond them*, distinct from the guṇas spoken of, and surpassing them. *and immutable*, devoid of decay, i.e. devoid of all changes such as birth (to which all beings are subject).

But how are people to go beyond this Divine *Māyā* (Illusion) of Viṣṇu, comprised of the three *guṇas*? The reply follows:

दैवी ह्येषा गुणमयी मम माया दुरत्यया ।
मामेव ये प्रपद्यन्ते मायामेतां तरन्ति ते ॥ १४ ॥

Daivī hyeṣā guṇamayī mama māyā duratyayā
Māmeva ye prapadyante māyām-etām taranti te .

14. Verily, this Divine Illusion (*Māyā*) of Mine, constituted of the *guṇas*, is difficult to cross over. Those who devote themselves to Me alone, they cross over this Illusion.

Verily, this, the aforesaid, *Divine Illusion* (*Māyā*) *of Mine*, inherent in Me, the Lord (Īśvara), Viṣṇu, *constituted of the gunas*, *is difficult to cross over*: going beyond it entails great hardship. Such being the case, *those who*, relinquishing all dharmas[6], *devote themselves to Me alone*, the Lord of Māyā, their own Self, with their whole being, *they cross over this Illusion*, which deludes all living beings; they are freed from the bond of saṁsāra.

If those who devote themselves to Thee can cross over this Illusion, why do not all devote themselves to Thee alone? This is answered—

न मां दुष्कृतिनो मूढाः प्रपद्यन्ते नराधमाः ।
माययाऽपहृतज्ञाना आसुरं भावमाश्रिताः ॥ १५ ॥

Na mām duṣkṛtino mūḍhāḥ prapadyante narādhamāḥ
Māyayā(a)pahṛta-jñānā āsuram bhāvam-aśritāḥ

15. The evil-doers, the deluded, the lowest of men, deprived of discrimination by Māyā, and following the way of Asuras, do not devote themselves to Me.

The *evil-doers*, committing sin, *the deluded, the lowest*, vilest, *of men*,—they, being *deprived of discrimination by Māyā*, and

6. See XVIII-66.

following the way of Asuras, marked by cruelty, untruth, and the like[7], *do not* devote themselves to Me, the Supreme Lord.

On the other hand, they who are the best of men, the men of virtuous deeds—

चतुर्विधा भजन्ते मां जनाः सुकृतिनोऽर्जुन ।
आर्तो जिज्ञासुरर्थार्थी ज्ञानी च भरतर्षभ ॥ १६ ॥

Caturvidhā bhajante mām janāḥ sukṛtino(a)rjuna
Ārto jijñāsur-arthārthī jñānī ca Bharatarṣabha

15. Four kinds of virtuous men worship Me, O Arjuna,—the distressed, the seeker of Knowledge, the seeker of riches, and the Wise, O bull among the Bhāratas.

Four kinds, classes, of virtuous men, men of good deeds, *worship* resort to, *Me, O Arjuna.* (They are:) *the distressed*, he who is in difficulty, such as being overpowered by a robber, a tiger, a disease, and the like, *the seeker of Knowledge*, (i.e., knowledge) concerning the true nature of the Lord, *the seeker of riches*, he who desires wealth, *end the Wise*, he who knows[8] the true nature of the Lord, Viṣṇu; *O bull among the Bhāratas.*

तेषां ज्ञानी नित्ययुक्त एकभक्तिर्विशिष्यते ।
प्रियो हि ज्ञानिनोऽत्यर्थमहं स च मम प्रियः ॥ १७ ॥

Teṣām jñānī nitya-yukta eka-bhaktir-viśiṣyate
Priyo hi jñāino(a)tyartham-aham sa ca mama priyaḥ

17. Of them, the Wise-man, ever steadfast, with devotion to the One, excels; for, supremely dear am I to the Wise, and he is dear to Me.

7. See XVI-7 to 20.

8. i.e. he who knows the teachings of Scripture (*śabda-jñāna*) and desires only the direct realisation of the true nature of the Self. (Ā)

Of them, among the four, *the Wise-man*, who knows the true nature (of the Lord), *ever steadfast*, by reason of his being the knower of the truth, *with devotion to the One*, because he does not see any other object worthy of adoration, *excels*, is superior; he surpasses (the rest); *for, supremely dear am I to the Wise*, being his very Self. It is well-known in this world that the Self is dear (to everybody). Therefore, to the Wise, Vāsudeva becomes dear, being his own Self. *And, he*, the Wise-man, *is* supremely *dear to Me*, because he is (My) Vāsudeva's very Self.

Then, are the three (others), the distressed and the rest, not dear to Vāsudeva? Not so. What then?

उदाराः सर्व एवैते ज्ञानी त्वात्मैव मे मतम् ।
आस्थितः स हि युक्तात्मा मामेवानुत्तमां गतिम् ॥ १८ ॥

Udārāḥ sarva evaite jñānī tvātmaiva me matam
Āsthitaḥ sa hi yuktātmā mām evānuttamām gatim

18. Noble indeed are all these; but the Wise-man I regard as My very Self; for, with the mind steadfast, he is established in Me alone, as the supreme goal.

Noble, eminent, indeed are all these: these three (other than the Wise-man) also are dear to Me. Verily, none who is My devotee can be *but* dear to Me, Vāsudeva. However the Wise-man, is supremely dear (to Me); that is the distinction. Why is it so? *The Wise-man I regard as My very Self*: it is My conviction that he is not different from Me (the Self); *for with the mind steadfast*, concentrated on the thought, "I am myself the Lord Vāsudeva, I am not different from Him (I am nobody else)", *he is established in Me alone*, having engaged himself in the attainment of Yoga, the Wise-man seeks to attain Me only, the Supreme Brahman, *as the supreme goal* to be reached.

The Wise-man is again praised—

बहूनां जन्मनामन्ते ज्ञानवान्मां प्रपद्यते ।
वासुदेवः सर्वमिति स महात्मा सुदुर्लभः ॥ १९ ॥

Bahūnām janmanām-ante jñānavān-mām prapadyate
Vāsudevaḥ sarvam-iti sa mahātmā su-durlabhaḥ

19. At the end of many births, the Man of Wisdom, takes refuge in Me, (realising) that all (this) is Vāsudeva. Very rare is that great soul.

At the end of many births during which he was engaged in acquiring the purification (of the intellect) that is the means to the attainment of Knowledge, *the Man of Wisdom* who has attained the fruit, Knowledge (in his current birth), *takes refuge in Me,* Vāsudeva, the innermost Self ("Pratyagātman"), directly. How? By realising *that all this is Vāsudeva* (Vāsudeva is all this). He who thus takes reguge in Me, the Self of all, *that great soul,* to whom there is neither an equal nor a superior, *is* therefore, *very rare:* as has been said. "Hardly one among thousands of men, etc." (VII-3).

Now, the reason why there is the absence (with regard to the others) of the perception that all is the Self-Vāsudeva alone, is being stated—

कामैस्तैस्तैर्हृतज्ञानाः प्रपद्यन्तेऽन्यदेवताः ।
तं तं नियममास्थाय प्रकृत्या नियताः स्वया ॥ २० ॥

Kāmais-tais-tair-hṛta-jñānāḥ prapadyante(a)nya-devatāḥ
Tam tam niyamam-āsthāya prakṛtyā niyatāḥ svayā

20. Those deprived of discrimination by this and that desire devote themselves to other gods, betaking themselves to this or that rite, led by their own natures.

Those deprived of discrimination by this and that desire, for progeny, cattle, "svarga" (heaven) and the like, *devote themselves,* resort, *to other gods,* other than Vāsudeva, the Self, *betaking themselves to this or that rite,* well-known as the means

of propitiating (those) gods, *led by their own natures*, governed by their own peculiar tendencies acquired in previous lives.

As regards these men with desires—

यो यो यां यां तनुं भक्तः श्रद्धयार्चितुमिच्छति ।
तस्य तस्याचलां श्रद्धां तामेव विदधाम्यहम् ॥ २१ ॥

Yo yo yām yām tanum bhaktah śraddhayā(a)rcitu-micchati
Tasya tasyācalām śraddhām tām-eva vidadhāmyaham

21. Whatever devotee seeks to worship whatsoever from with *śraddhā*, that same *śraddhā* of his do I make unflinching.

Whatever devotee, having a desire, *seeks to worship whatsoever form* of god (devatā) *with śraddhā, that same śraddhā of his*, of that man of desire, *do I make unflinching*, stabilised.

That is to say: for that person who, through his natural tendency, initially engages himself in the worship of a particular divine form with faith, (I stabilise that faith of his).

स तया श्रद्धया युक्तस्तस्याराधनमीहते ।
लभते च ततः कामान् मयैव विहितान् हि तान् ॥ २२ ॥

Sa tayā śraddhayā yuktas-tasyārādhanam-īhate
Labhate ca tataḥ kāmān mayaiva vihitān hi tān

22. Endued with that *śraddhā*, he engages in the worship of that, and from it, gains his desires—these being verily dispensed by Me alone.

Being *endued with that śraddhā*—stabilised by Me, *he engages*, exerts himself, *in the worship of that* form of the Deity, *and from it*, divine form (so) worshipped, *gains his desires*, those that he wished

for—*these being verily dispensed*, ordained, *by Me alone*, the Supreme, Lord (Parameśvara). Omniscient, knowing the relationship between actions and results. Because the (devotee's) objects of desire are ordained by the Lord, therefore he is sure to obtain them.

If 'hitān' is taken as one word (meaning 'salutary') (in stead of as 'hi tān'; verily these'), then we should fancy that desires are spoken of as salutary, by way of flattery (not in the primary sense); for, in truh, they are not beneficial to anybody.

Because they are men with desires, are unwise, and engage in means productive of limited result, therefore—

अन्तवत्तु फलं तेषां तद्भवत्यल्पमेधसाम् ।
देवान्देवयजो यान्ति मद्भक्ता यान्ति मामपि ॥ २३ ॥

Antavat-tu phalam teṣām tad-bhavatyalpa-medhasām
Devān-deva yājo yānti mad-bhaktā yānti mām-api

23. The fruit (accruing) to those men of little understanding is limited: the worshippers of the gods go to the gods. My devotees too come to Me.

The fruit (accruing) to those men of little understanding is limited, transient: *the worshippers of the gods*, those who worship gods, *go to the gods. My devotees too come to Me.*

"Thus, when (even though) the amount of exertion is the same (in the two kinds of worship), people do not resort to (take refuge in) Me, by doing which they may attain infinite results. Alas! it is very miserable"—so does the Lord express His pity.

Why do they not take refuge in (resort to) Me ? The reply follows:

अव्यक्तं व्यक्तिमापन्नं मन्यन्ते मामबुद्धयः ।
परं भावमजानन्तो ममाव्ययमनुत्तमम् ॥ २४ ॥

Avyaktam vyaktim-āpannam manyante mām-abuddhayaḥ
Param bhāvam-ajānanto mamāvyayam-anuttamam

24. The foolish regard Me as the unmanifested coming into manifestation, not knowing My supreme state, the immutable and the transcendental.

The foolish, those devoid of discrimination, *regard Me, as the unmanifested*, something that was hidden to view, *coming into manifestation*, having now become visible, although I am the Lord (Īśvara), ever luminous (eternally present to view), *not knowing My supreme state*, as the Supreme Self—*the immutable*, not subject to change, *and transcendental*, unsurpassed[9].

To what reason is their ignorance due? The answer is:

नाहं प्रकाशः सर्वस्य योगमायासमावृतः ।
मूढोऽयं नाभिजानाति लोको मामजमव्ययम् ॥ २५ ॥

Nāham prakāśaḥ sarvasya yoga-māyā-samāvṛtaḥ
Mūdho(a)yam nābhijānāti loko mām-ajam-avyayam

25. I am not manifest to all, veiled (as I am) by *Yoga-Māyā*. This deluded world knows Me not, the Unborn, the Immutable.

I am not manifest to all people; the implied meaning is: I am manifest only to a few, who are My devotees,—*veiled (as I am) by Yoga-Māyā*, being concealed by Māyā, which is the yoga, i.e. combination, of the (three) guṇas. Hence, *this deluded world knows Me not, Unborn, the Immutable.*

Enveloped as I am by *Yoga-Māyā*, the world does not recognise Me; not so does this *Yoga-Māyā* obstruct My knowledge—

9. They think that the Lord was (just like any other being subject to the six modifications) not present to view before taking up His *līlā*-form (form taken for His sport), and that His having become visible in His present form is due to adventitiousness. (Ā)

the knowledge of the Lord (Īśvara), possessor of *Māyā*;—being My own (i.e. it is under My control), just as the jugglery (*māyā*) of any juggler (*māyāvin*) does not (obstruct) his knowledge. Wherefore.

वेदाहं समतीतानि वर्तमानानि चार्जुन ।
भविष्याणि च भूतानि मां तु वेद न कश्चन ॥ २६ ॥

Vedāham samatītāni vartamānāni cārjuna
Bhaviṣyāṇi ca bhūtāni mām tu veda na kaścana

26. I know, O Arjuna, the beings of the whole past, and those of the present, as also those of the future; but Me none knows.

I, on the other hand, *know the beings of the whole past*, those who have passed away, *and* I know *those*, the beings, *of the present, as also those of the future*; *but Me none knows*, except that one who is My devotee and takes refuge in Me. It is only because of the want of the knowledge concerning My real Being that (the ordinary) man does not worship Me..[10]

The question arises: "Obstructed by what impediment to knowing Thy real Being, do all creatures born (in this world) fail to know Thee?" This is answered:

इच्छाद्वेषसमुत्थेन द्वन्द्वमोहेन भारत ।
सर्वभूतानि संमोहं सर्गे यान्ति परन्तप ॥ २७ ॥

Icchā-dveṣa-samutthena dvandva-mohena Bhārata
Sarvā-bhūtāni sammoham sarge yānti parantapa

27. By the delusion of the pairs, arising from desire and aversion, O descendant of Bharata, all beings fall into delusion at birth, O scorcher of foes.

10. (True) worship of the Lord is possible only for the enlightened; not for anybody bereft of enlightenment. (Ā)

By the delusion of the pairs, arising from desire and aversion— The paris are the cause of delusion. Desire and aversion, which are mutually opposed like cold and heat, and which, arising in connection with pleasure and pain and their causes, are felt by every being, each at its proper time, are called the pairs. Now, when desire and aversion manifest themselves on meeting with pleasure and pain, or their causes, they bring under their own sway he intelligence of all beings and thereby produce delusion, which is the obstruction to the rise of the Knowledge concerning the Supreme Reality, the Self. And as is well known, in one whose mind is subjugated by the evils of desire and aversion, knowledge of matters as they are, even of the external world, cannot arise; need it be said that to a person whose intellect is taken possession of by them, and who becomes deluded. Knowledge of the Innermost Self, the attainment of which is beset with many obstacles, cannot arise? Therefore, by the delusion of the paris, arising from desire and aversion. *O descendant of Bharata, all beings* become ignorant; and *fall into delusion at the time of birth, O scorcher of foes.*

The meaning is: all beings taking birth are in fact born subject to delusion. Because of this, all beings, with their intelligence impeded by the delusion of the pairs and so deluded, fail to know Me, their very Self, and consequently do not worship Me as the Self.

Who then are they who being free from the delusion of the pairs, know Thee and worship Thee as the Self., according to scriptural teaching? Disclosing the answer to this enquiry, the Lord says—

येषां त्वन्तगतं पापं जनानां पुण्यकर्मणाम् ।
ते द्वन्द्वमोहनिर्मुक्ता भजन्ते मां दृढव्रताः ॥ २८ ॥

Yeṣām tvantagatam pāpam janānām puṇya-karmaṇām

Te dvandva-moha-nirmuktā bhajante mām dṛḍha-vratāḥ

28. But, those men of virtuous deeds, whose sin has come to an end,—they, freed from the delusion of the pairs of opposites, worship Me with firm resolve.

But, on the other hand, *those men of virtuous deeds*, which bring about the purification of the mind (sattva-śuddhi), *whose sin has* almost *come to an end, they freed from the delusion of the pairs of opposites*, spoken of above, *worship Me*, the Supreme Self, *with firm resolve.* They are said to be of firm resolve, because they have resolutely discarded everything (else) and have the settled understanding that 'the Supreme Reality is thus only, and not otherwise'.

What for do they worship Thee? The reply follows:

जरामरणमोक्षाय मामाश्रित्य यतन्ति ये ।
ते ब्रह्म तद्विदुः कृत्स्नमध्यात्मं कर्म चाखिलम् ॥ २९ ॥

Jarā-maraṇa-mokṣāya mām-āśritya yatanti ye

Te Brahma tad-viduḥ kṛtsnam-adhyātmam karma cākhilam

29. All those who taking refuge in Me, strive for liberation from decay and death, they know Brahman, the whole of *Adhyātma*, and *Karma* in its entirety.

All those who taking refuge in Me, with the mind concentrated in Me, the Supreme Lord (Parameśvara), *strive*[11] *for liberation from decay and death*, old age and death, *they know Brahman*, the Supreme; *the whole of Adhyātma*: they realise in full the Reality underlying the innermost individual Self; *and Karma in its entirety*; they understand all about action.

11. They take to the performance of *yajñas* and the like (the remote means) and the practice of *śravana* etc. (the initimate means) for securing devotion to the Lord (*Bhagavan-niṣṭhā*). (Ā)

साधिभूताधिदैवं मां साधियज्ञं च ये विदुः ।
प्रयाणकालेऽपि च मां ते विदुर्युक्तचेतसः ॥ ३० ॥

Sādhibhūtādhidaivam mām sādhiyajñam ca ye viduḥ
Prayāṇa-kāle(a)pi ca mām te vidur-yukta-cetasaḥ

30. Those who know Me, with the *Adhibhūta*, and the *Adhidaiva*, and (also) with the *Adhiyajña*, realise Me even at the time of departure, steadfast in mind.

Those who know Me with the Adhi-bhuta[12] *and the Adhi-daiva*[12], *and* (also) *with the Adhi-yajna*[12], *realise,* experience, *Me, even at the time of departure,* death, *steadfast in mind,* with the mind concentrated[13].

इति श्रीमहाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्यां
भीष्मपर्वणि श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु
ब्रह्मविद्यायां योगशास्त्रे श्रीकृष्णार्जुन-
संवादे ज्ञान-विज्ञान-योगो नाम
सप्तमोऽध्यायः ॥

Iti Śrī-Mahābharate śatasāhasryām samhitāyām Vaiyāsikyām Bhīṣma-Parvaṇi Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītāsūpaniṣatsu

12. The commentary gives only the grammatical derivation of these three compound words in the text. They are explained in the next chapter, as also the terms 'Brahman' etc. referred to in the previous verse.

13. Those who are devoted to the Lord do not merely know Brahman as the whole of *Adhyātmā* (*Adhi-ātmā*) and *Karma* in its entirety; they also know the Lord with the *Adhi-bhūta* and the two others mentioned in this verse. At the moment of death, there is failure of the intellect (for ordinary beings), owing to the destruction of the sense; but in the case of the men of concentrated mind who have the knowledge (of the pentad) aforesaid, knowledge concerning the true Being of the Lord is present without any effort. (Ā)

Brahma-vidyāyām yoga śāstre Śrī Kṛṣṇarjuna-samvāde Jñāna-vijñāna-yogo nāma saptamo(a)dhyāyaḥ.

Thus the seventh chapter entitled 'Way of Knowledge with Realisation' in the Upaniṣads known as 'The Celebrated Songs of the Lord' expounding the Knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna—embodied in the Bhīṣma-Parva of Śrī Mahābhārata, the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyāsa.

॥ अष्टमोऽध्यायः ॥

(तारकब्रह्मयोगः)

AṢṬAMO(A)DHYAYAḤ

(*TĀRAKA BRAHMA YOGAḤ*)

CHAPTER – VIII

(SAVING KNOWLEDGE OF BRAHMAN)

In the passage beginning, 'they know Brahman, the whole of Adhyātma' (VII-29, 30), topics which give rise to further questioning on the part of Arjuna have been taught by the Lord; therefore, desiring to enquire about them.

अर्जुन उवाच—

किं तद्ब्रह्म किमध्यात्मं किं कर्म पुरुषोत्तम ।
अधिभूतं च किं प्रोक्तमधिदैवं किमुच्यते ॥ १ ॥
अधियज्ञः कथं कोऽत्र देहेऽस्मिन्मधुसूदन ।
प्रयाणकाले च कथं ज्ञेयोऽसि नियतात्मभिः ॥ २ ॥

Arjuna uvāca—

Kim tad-Brahma kim-adhyātmam kim karma Puruṣottama
Adhibhūtam ca kim proktam-adhidaivam kim-ucyate

Adhiyajñaḥ katham ko(a)tra dehe(a)smin-Madhu-sūdana
Prayāṇa-kāle ca katham jñeyo(a)si niyatātmabhiḥ

Arjuna said—

1, 2. What is that Brahman? What is *Adhyatma*?

What is *Karma*, O Puruṣottama?[1] What is called *Adhibhūta*? And what is said to be *Adhi-daiva*? And, who, in that way, is *Adhiyajña*, in this body, O destroyer of Madhu? And, how art Thou known at the time of death, by the self-controlled?

For settling these points at issue in their serial order.

श्रीभगवानुवाच—
अक्षरं ब्रह्म परमं स्वभावोऽध्यात्ममुच्यते ।
भूतभावोद्भवकरो विसर्गः कर्मसंज्ञितः ॥ ३ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Akṣaram Brahma paramam svabhāvo(a)dhyatmam-ucyate

Bhūta-bhāvodbhava-karo visargaḥ karma-saṁjñitaḥ

The Blessed Lord said—

3. The Imperishable is the Supreme Brahman. (His) nature is called *Adhyātma*. The offering which brings forth the existence of beings is called *Karma*.

The Imperishable—Akṣara, That which never wanes—*is the Supreme* Self (Paramātman), *Brahman*, in accordance with the Śruti, "O Gārgi, it is at the command of this Akṣara that the sun and the moon stand held in their places" (Bṛ. III.viii. 9). The akṣara (syllable) Om, referred to in "the one-syllable 'Om', the Brahman" (VII-13), is not to be understood here (as Brahman), because of the attribute (supreme) (paramam); on the contrary, the epithet 'supreme' is more apt with respect to the transcendental Imperishable Brahman. *His* innate *nature*, the

1. Best of *Purusas* (persons), He who transcends the perishable and even the Imperishable (XV. 18)—Com. on Name 24 in V.S.).

state of that very same Supreme Brahman existing in every body as the Innermost Śelf (Pratyagātman), *is called Adhyātma* the condition of the Real, in relation to the body, which reveals Itself (at the beginning) as the Innermost Self, and which ends up as the Supreme Truth, Brahman, is "sva-bhāva," and this is denoted by the term "Adhyātma". *The offering* of materials such as cooked rice, cakes, etc. to gods—this sacrificual act (yajña) consisting in giving away, *which brings forth the existence of beings* which causes the origination of all creatues, *is called Karma,* is known by the term "Karma"; since, it is indeed from this (yajña), constituting the seed (source) that all beings, inanimate and animate, come into existence, through rain and the rest in the regular order[2].

अधिभूतं क्षरो भावः पुरुषश्चाधिदैवतम् ।
अधियज्ञोऽहमेवात्र देहे देहभृतां वर ॥ ४ ॥

Adhibhūtam kṣaro bhāvaḥ puruṣaś-cadhidaivatam
Adhiyajño(a)hamevātra dehe deha-bhṛtām vara

4. The perishable existence is the *Adhibhūta*; and the Puruṣa is *Adhidaivata*; I Myself ạm the *Adhi-yajña*, here in this body, O best of the embodied.

Adhibhūta means that whose compass is the aggregate of animate beings. What is that? *It is the perishable existence*, that is to say, whatever there is that is subject to birth. *And the Puruṣa*—he by whom all this is filled, or he who lies in the city (body)[3]—he is the Hiraṇya-garbha seated in the sun (Āditya), (presiding over and) favouring the sense-organs of all living beings: he *is the Adhidaivata.* The *Adhi-yajña* is He who identifies himself with all yajñas (sacrifices), the Deity named Viṣṇu, according to the Śruti, "Yajña (Sacrifice) is indeed Viṣṇu" (Tai-Saṁ. I.7.4). That Viṣṇu indeed, *I Myself am;—here, id this body,*

2. vide III. 14. (A)

3. The body of Virāt is here meant. The *Antaryāmin* (Inner Ruler) who is seated within the gods in the solar and other worlds is the Puruṣa. (A)

whatever sacrifice there is, of that I am *the Adhiyajña.* Sacrifice is verily to be performed by the body and therefore it is inseparable from it; consequently it is regarded as resting in the body, *O best of the embodied.*

अन्तकाले च मामेव स्मरन्मुक्त्वा कलेवरम् ।
यः प्रयाति स मद्भावं याति नास्त्यत्र संशयः ॥ ५ ॥

Antakāle ca mām-eva smaran-muktvā kalevaram
Yaḥ prayāti sa mad-bhāvam yāti nāstyatra saṁśayaḥ

5. And he, who at the time of death, meditating on Me alone, goes forth, leaving the body, attains My Being: there is no doubt of this.

And he, who at the time of death, at the moment of dying, *meditating on Me alone,* Viṣṇu, the Supreme Lord (Parameśvara), *goes forth, leaving,* abandoning, *the body, attains My Being,* the Reality that is Viṣṇu: *there is no doubt of this*—there is no room for any doubt in the matter, whether he attains (Me) or not.

This rule applies not with respect of Me alone; but also,

यं यं वापि स्मरन्भावं त्यजत्यन्ते कलेवरम् ।
तं तमेवैति कौन्तेय सदा तद्भावभावितः ॥ ६ ॥

Yam yam vāpi smaram-bhāvam tyajatyante kalevaram
Tam tam-evaiti Kaunteya sadā tad-bhāva-bhāvitaḥ

6. Thinking of whatever entity, at the end, one leaves the body, that alone he reaches, O son of Kuntī, having been constant in the thought of that entity.

Thinking of whatever entity, a particular god (Devatā), *at the end,* at the time of death (lit. disunion of the vital air from the body), *one leaves the body, that alone,* only the entity thought of, *he reaches,*—and no other—*O son of Kumti having been constant*

in the thought of that entity, the rememberance of that entity having always been practised by him.

Wherefore the last thought is thus the cause (which determines the character) of the body to be next attained—

तस्मात्सर्वेषु कालेषु मामनुस्मर युध्य च ।
मय्यर्पितमनोबुद्धिर्मामेवैष्यस्यसंशयः ॥ ७ ॥

Tasmāt-sarveṣu kāleṣu mām-anusmara yudhya ca
Mayyarpita-mano-buddhir-mām-
evaiṣyasyasaṃśayaḥ

7. Therefore, at all times, constantly remember Me and fight. With mind and intellect set on Me, you shall doubtless come to Me alone.

Therefore, at all times, constantly remember Me, according to the teaching (Śāstra)[4], *and fight*, engage in your prescribed duty of fighting. *With mind and intellect set on Me*, Vāsudeva, *you shall doubtless come to Me alone*, as meditated upon by you; there is no doubt of this.

Moreover,

अभ्यासयोगयुक्तेन चेतसा नान्यगामिना ।
परमं पुरुषं दिव्यं याति पार्थानुचिन्तयन् ॥ ॥ ८ ॥

Abhyāsa-yoga-yuktena cetasā nānya-gāminā
Paramam Puruṣam divyam yāti Pārthānucintayan

8. With the mind engaged in the Yoga of constant practice, not moving towards anything else, and dwelling in the Supreme, Resplendent Puruṣa, O Pārtha, one goes to Him.

4. This signifies that the remembrance is to be practised always with close application and uninterruptedly. (Ā)

With the mind engaged in the Yoga of constant practice: practice is the repetition of the same thought or idea—uninterrupted by any different thought—with respect to Me, the sole object wherein the mind is to be consigned; such practice is itself Yoga; and the mind of a Yogi is solely engaged in this Yoga. With such a mind, *not moving towards anything else*, not tending to pass over to any other object, *and dwelling in*, that is to say, meditating according to the instruction of Scripture (Śāstra) and the Teacher (Acārya), on *the Supreme, Resplendent Puruṣa*, the Transcendental Being, residing in the heavens i.e. the Solar Orb, *O Pārtha, one goes to Him.*

What are the characteristics of the Puruṣa whom he reaches? The reply follows:

कविं पुराणमनुशासितारमणोरणीयांसमनुस्मरेद्यः ।
सर्वस्य धातारमचिन्त्यरूपमादित्यवर्णं तमसः परस्तात् ॥ ९ ॥

Kavim purāṇam-anuśāsitāram-aṇoraṇiyāmsam-anusmared-yaḥ

Sarvasya dhātāram-acintya-rūpam āditya-varṇam tamasaḥ parastāt

9. The Sage, the Ancient, the Over-Ruler, minuter than the atom, the Sustainer of all, of form inconceivable, glorious like the Sun, and beyond darkness—he who meditates on Him thus, (goes to Him).

The Sage, the Omniscient, the All-wise, *the Ancient, the Over-Ruler*, who governs the entire universe, *minuter than even the atom* which is itself minute, *the Sustainer of all*, Who dispenses the entire aggregate of the fruits of all actions, apportioning them to all creatures in wonderfully multifarious ways, *of form inconceivable*, Whose form, though definite and realisable, is incapable of being conceived by anybody with his mind, *glorious like the Sun*, Who, like the Sun, is resplendent with the Effulgence of His Eternal Intelligence ("nitya-caitanya-prakāśa"), *and beyond the darkness*

of delusion ("moha") in the form of nescience (ajñāna)—*he who meditates on Him thus.*

(*Goes to Him*): in this manner this verse is to be connected with the previous one.

Besides,

प्रयाणकाले मनसाऽचलेन भक्त्या युक्तो योगबलेन चैव ।
भ्रुवोर्मध्ये प्राणमावेश्यसम्यक् स तं परं पुरुषमुपैति दिव्यम् ॥ १० ॥

Prayaṇa-kāle manasā(a)calena bhaktyā yukto yoga-balena caiva

Bhruvor-madhye prāṇam-āveśya samyak sa tam param Puruṣam-upaiti divyam

10. At the time of departure, with the mind unmoving and endued with devotion and strength of Yoga, well-fixing the Prāṇa betwixt the eye-brows, he goes to that Supreme, Resplendent Puruṣa.

At the time of departure, death, *with the mind unmoving*, devoid of wandering motion *and endued with devotion*, supreme attachment (to Him), *and strength of Yoga*, consisting in the steadiness of the mind brought about by the accumulated influence produced by samādhi (concentration); initially bringing the mind under control in the lotus of the heart (hṛdaya-puṇḍarīka), and then, through the upward-going "nāḍi"[5], by the process of subduing earth (and other elements) in their order, *well-fixing the Prāṇa betwixt the eye-brows*, i.e. being careful (in doing this)—*he*, the wise man, the Yogin who does so, *goes, to*, reaches, *that Supreme, Resplendent Puruṣa*, described as 'the Sage, the Ancient, etc.' (VIII.9).

To that Brahman who is sought to be reached by the means to be further stated hereafter, and Who is being defined by such

5. called the *Suṣumnā*. (Ā)

attributes as 'being spoken of by the knowers of the Veda'; the Lord gives a name—

यदक्षरं वेदविदो वदन्ति विशन्ति यद्यतयो वीतरागाः ।
यदिच्छन्तो ब्रह्मचर्यं चरन्ति तत्तेपदं संग्रहेण प्रवक्ष्ये ॥११॥

Yad-akṣaram vedavido vadanti viśanti yad-yatayo vīta-rāgāḥ
Yadi-icchanto brahmacaryam caranti tat-te padam saṁgraheṇa pravakṣye

11. What the knowers of the Veda speak of as the Imperishable, what the self-controlled freed from attachment enter into, to gain which they live the life of a *brahmācarin*, that goal I shall declare unto you in brief.

What the knowers of the meaning of the *Veda speak of as the Imperishable*, that which does not decay, as stated in Śruti, "This verily is that, the Imperishable, O Gārgi, as the Brāhmaṇas declare" (Bṛ. III.viii.8). This they speak of by negating all attributes, in the words, "not gross, not subtle" (Bṛ. III. viii. 8).

What else? *What the self-controlled*, those who have striven (after mokṣa), the saṁnyāsins *freed from attachment*, *enter into*, on the attainment of True Knowledge (samyag-darśana); and *to gain* the knowledge of (—this has to be understood here—) *which they live the life of a brahmacārin* with the Guru, *that goal*, that which has to be reached, called the Imperishable (Akṣara). *I shall declare unto you in brief*, I shall tell you with brevity.

*

Commencing with the words, "'He who verily among mortals, meditates on the syllable Om till death, Venerable Sir, what region does he thereby win?[6]' To him he said, 'O Satyakāma, this the

6. These words were spoken by Satyakāma to Sage Pippalāda; and the reply of the Sage follows. (Ā)

Brahman, the Higher and the Lower, is the syllable Om ' '' (Pr. V-1, 2), it is further stated, " He who meditates on the Supreme Puruṣa by this very syllable Om of three mātras (he is borne up... to the region of Brahman)'' (Pr.V.5). And, again commencing with the words, "Other than dharma (virtue), other than adharma (vice)'' (Ka.I.ii.14), it is stated, "What all the Vedas declare, and what all austerities speak of, and seeking which people lead the life of *brahmacarya*—the goal I shall tell you in brief. It is Om '' (Ka.I.ii. 15). In such passages as the above, the syllable Om is declared to be the significant appellation for, or an image-like symbol of, Brahman,—by reason of its being the means for persons of dull and mediocre intellects to the understanding of the Supreme Brahman—and its meditation is said to result, in due course, in liberation (*mukti*). That very same meditation yielding the fruit of *mukti* in due course of time, of the syllable Om, which—in the manner specified above[7]—constitutes the means to the comprehension of the Supreme Brahman referred to in the passages, "The Sage, the Ancient'' (VIII-9) and "What the knowers of the Veda speak of as the Imperishable'' (VIII-11), has to be taugh) here also, together with steadfastness of *Yoga* (*yoga-dhāraṇat*) as well as other matters pertaining to and closely connected with the main subject.[8] With this aim, the text proceeds as follows.

सर्वद्वाराणि संयम्य मनो हृदि निरुध्य च ।
मूर्ध्न्याधायात्मनः प्राणमास्थितो योगधारणाम् ॥ १२ ॥

Sarva-dvārāṇi saṁyaṁya mano hṛdi nirudhya ca
Mūrdhnyādhāyātmanaḥ prāṇam-āsthito yoga-dhāraṇam

12. Closing all the gates, and confining the mind in the heart, placing his Prāṇa in the head, occupied in steadiness of yoga.

(The sentence is completed in the next verse.)

7. As being the significant expression (appellation) for and the symbol of Brahman. (Ā)

8. The method of meditating on the *Praṇava*, and its fruit, leading to the cessation of rebirth. (Ā)

Closing all the gates, the openings[9] through which knowledge (of objects) is reached, *and confining the mind in the heart*, restraining it (mind) in the lotus of the heart and thereby rendering it motion-less—and with the mind thus controlled, raising up *his Prāṇa* by the nāḍi proceeding upwards from the heart and *placing it in the head*; *occupied*, engaged, *in* preserving *steadiness of yoga*

Holding (the Prāṇa) there alone.

ओमित्येकाक्षरं ब्रह्म व्याहरन्मामनुस्मरन् ।
यः प्रयाति त्यजन्देहं स याति परमां गतिम् ॥ १३ ॥

Om-ityekākṣaram Brahma vyāharan-mām-anusmaran
Yaḥ prayāti tyajan-deham sa yāti paramām gatim

13. Uttering the one-syllabled Om, the Brahman, and meditating on Me,—he who departs, leaving the body, attains the Supreme Goal.

Uttering, pronouncing, *the one-syllabled Om*, the appellation of *the Brahman, and meditating on*, thinking constantly of, *Me*, the object denoted thereby, Īśvara,—*he who departs*, dies, *leaving the body*—this phrase is used for describing the departure, namely, that the departure of the Self takes place by abandoning the body; and not that it dies through itself getting destroyed,—*attains*, reaches, *the Supreme*, the most exalted, *Goal*[10].

Moreover.

अनन्यचेताः सततं यो मां स्मरति नित्यशः ।
तस्याहं सुलभः पार्थ नित्ययुक्तस्य योगिनः ॥ १४ ॥

Ananya-cetāḥ satatam yo mām samarati nityaśaḥ
Tasyāyam sulabhaḥ Pārtha nitya-yuktasya yoginaḥ

9. The sense-organs, of hearing and the rest. (Ā)

10. Krama-mukti (release by steps) is to be understood. (Ā)

14. With the mind not thinking of any other object, whoso remembers Me constantly and eternally, by that ever-steadfast yogin, O Pārtha, I am easily attainable.

With the mind not thinking of any other object,whoso, meaning, a yogin, *remembers Me,* the Supreme Lord (Parameśvara), *constantly,* uninterruptedly, *and eternally,* for long—that is, not for six months or a year, but throughout life, *by that ever-steadfast,* perpetually self-composed, *yogin, I am easily attainable, O Pārtha.* This being so, one should therefore have his mind ever concentrated on Me, without thinking of anything else.

" What avails by Thy being easily attainable ??"

" Listen to what, I shall tell you, ensues from My easy accessibility ":

मामुपेत्य पुनर्जन्म दुःखालयमशाश्वतम् ।
नाप्नुवन्ति महात्ममानः संसिद्धिं परमां गताः ॥ १५ ॥

Mām-upetya punar-janma duhkhālayam-aśāśvatam
Nāpnuvanti mahātmānaḥ saṁsiddhim paramām gatāḥ

15. Having attained Me, the great-souled ones do not again get birth, which is the abode of pain and is ephemeral,—they having reached highest perfection.

Having attained Me, the Īśvara—that is, having reached My Being,—the *great-souled ones,* the self-controlled ascetics, *do not again get birth,* are not subject to rebirth. What is the nature of rebirth which they do not suffer? It is thus characterised: it *is the abode of pain*: birth is the home, the resting place, to which all misery arising from the body etc. cling. It is not merely the abode of pain; it *is* besides *ephemeral,* unstable (ever-changing) in nature. The great-souled ones do not suffer this kind of rebirth, *they having reached highest perfection,* the most exalted state called

mokṣa (release). Those, on the other hand, who do not reach Me, return again (are reborn).

Do they, who have reached somebody other than Thyself, return again?

The reply follows:

आब्रह्मभुवनाल्लोकाः पुनरावर्तिनोऽर्जुन ।
मामुपेत्य तु कौन्तेय पुनर्जन्म न विद्यते ॥ १६ ॥

Ābrahma-bhuvanāllokāḥ punarāvartino(a)rjuna
Mām-upetya tu Kaunteya punar janma na vidyate

16. The worlds, upto the realm of Brahmā, are subject to returning again, O Arjuna; but after attaining to Me, O son of Kuntī, there is no rebirth.

A world is that where beings are born and live. All *the worlds upto*, that is, including, *the realm of Brahmā, are subject to returning again*, are inherently productive of birth, *O Arjuna*; *but after attaining to Me* alone. *O son of Kuntī, there is no rebirth*, no metemphsychosis.

Why are the worlds, including the realm of Brahmā, subject to returning? Because they are limited by time. How?

सहस्रयुगपर्यन्तमहर्यद्ब्रह्मणो विदुः ।
रात्रिं युगसहस्रान्तां तेऽहोरात्रविदो जनाः ॥ १७ ॥

Sahasra-yuga-paryantam-ahar-yad-brahmaṇo viduḥ
Rātrim yuga-sahasrāntām te(a)horātra-vido janāḥ

17. They know the day of Brahmā the limit of which is a thousand (*Catur*) *yugas*, and the night which ends in a thousand (*Catur*) *yugas*;—they are the men who know day and night.

They know the day (*day-time*) *of Brahmā*, Prajāpati, the Virāṭ, *the limit of which is a thousand* (*catur*) *yugas*[11], which ends in a thousand (catur-) yugas, *and the night* (*of Brahma*) as well *which ends in a thousand* (*catur*) *yugas*, (i.e.) which is of the same measure as his day. Who are they that know (thus)? *They are the men who know day and night*, who understand the reckoning of time. Because the worlds are thus circumscribed in time, therefore are they subject to returning.

That which happens during the day of Prajāpati and that which happens during his night will now be stated:

अव्यक्ताद्व्यक्तयः सर्वाः प्रभवन्त्यहरागमे ।
रात्र्यागमे प्रलीयन्ते तत्रैवाव्यक्त संज्ञके ॥ १८ ॥

Avyaktād-vyaktayaḥ sarvāḥ prabhavantyahar āgame
Rātṛyāgame pralīyante tatraivāvyakta saṁjñake

18. From the unmanifested (state), all manifestations proceed at the coming on of day; at the coming on of night, they merge there alone, in what is called the unmanifested.

From the unmanifested, the state of sleep of Prajāpati, *all manifestations*, all creatures, the immobile and the mobile, *proceed*, come into view, *at the coming on of day*, the time of Brahmaā's (Prājapati's) waking. So also, *at the coming on of night*, when Brahmā goes to sleep, *they*, all the manifestations, *merge there alone*, in the aforesaid, *in what is called the unmanifested.*

In order to repel the faulty inference that one would be subject to a result not produced by his own action or would not reap the fruit of what he has himself committed: in order to show that the teaching of the Scripture regarding bondage (*bandha*) and liberation (*mokṣa*) is fruitful (i.e. has a definite purpose); and, in order to teach non-attachment (*vairāgya*) to worldly life (*saṁsāra*) by showing that the multitude of creatures is born again and again,

11. See note 13.

each in spite of itself, as a result of the store of *karma* produced by nescience (avidyā) and the other troubles[12], the Lord says, as follows:

भूतग्रामः स एवायं भूत्वा भूत्वा प्रलीयते ।
रात्र्यागमेऽवशः पार्थ प्रभवत्यहरागमे ॥ १९ ॥

Bhūta-grāmaḥ sa evāyam bhūtva bhūtva pralīyate
Ratṛyāgame(a)vaśaḥ Pārtha prabhavatyaharāgame

19. The very same multitude of beings, being born again and again, merges, in spite of itself, O Pārtha, at the coming on of night, and remanifests itself at the coming on of day.

The very same multitude of beings, the entire creation, comprising the immobile and the mobile, that existed in the previous "kalpa"[13], and not any other, *being born again and again* at the coming on of day, *merges* again and again *at the coming on of night*, at the end of the day, *in spite*, *of itself* involuntarily, O Partha, and *re-manifests itself*, involuntarily again, *at the coming on of day*.

The means to reach the Imperishable (*Akṣara*) referred to above has been indicated in the passage, " uttering the one-syllabled Om " etc. (VIII-13). Now, then, with the object of declaring the true nature of that very same *Akṣara*, which is the goal to be reached by this path of *yoga*, the Lord says:

12. The troubles (*kleśas*) are: (1) ignorance (nescience, *avidyā*), (2) egoism (*asmitā*), (3) attachment (*rāga*), (4) aversion (*dveṣa*), and (5) clinging to life (*abhiniveśa*). [*Patañjali-Yoga-Sūtras* II. 3]. (Ā)

13. " *kalpa* " is the day of Brahmā, consisting of 1000 *catur-yugas*, thousand four-*yuga*-cycles, or 4,320 million human years. There are four *Yugas*: *kṛta* or *satya*, *treta*, *dvāpara* and *kali*, respectively consisting of 4800; 3600; 2400 and 1200 Celestial years. A year (360 days) of the humans make a single day of the celestials. Therefore by the human calendar the four yugas consist respectively of 1,728,000; 1,296,000; 864,000 and 432,000 years; the four together, i.e., a *catur-or-"mahā"-yuga* comprises 4,320,000 human years.

परस्तस्मात्तु भावोऽन्योऽव्यक्तोऽव्यक्तात् सनातनः ।
यः स सर्वेषु भूतेषु नश्यत्सु न विनश्यति ॥ २० ॥

Paras-tasmāt-tu bhāvo(a)nyo (a)vyakto (a)vyaktāt-sanātanaḥ
Yaḥ sa sarveṣu-bhūteṣu naśyatsu na vinaśyati

20. But, distinct from that unmanifested, is the other Being, the Unmanifested[14] and Eternal. He (that Being) is That which does not perish on the destruction of all beings.

But—this word indicates that what is to be described is different from the unmanifested;—*distinct from*, surpassing, *that unmanifested*, stated above (in verse 18) *is the other*, distinguished, *Being*, the Supreme Brahman, called the Akṣara (Imperishable). The word 'other' ('distinguished') has been used by the Lord to remove any assumption that though different (from the avyakta, the unmanifested) the Akṣara is of the same nature. He is of a different nature; He is *the Unmanifested*, not cognisable by the senses. From what is he distinct? From the unmanifested which was previously mentioned, of the form of avidyā, which is the seed (origin) of the entire multitude of beings. He is *Eternal*, ancient. *He is That* Being (Existence) *which does not perish on the destruction of all beings*, from Brahmā downwards.

अव्यक्तोऽक्षर इत्युक्तस्तमाहुः परमां गतिम् ।
यं प्राप्य न निवर्तन्ते तद्धाम परमं मम ॥ २१ ॥

Avyakto(a)kṣara ityuktas-tam-ahuḥ paramām gatim
Yam prāpya na nivartante tad-dhāma paramam mama.

14. This Unmanifested (Eternal Principle) is different from the unmanifested (*mūla-prakṛti*: the first evolver of the material world) till now referred to.

21. What has been called the Unmanifested and Imperishable, That, they say, is the supreme goal. Having reached which none return, that is My highest abode.

What has been called the Unmanifested and Imperishable, That, the very same Unmanifested Being, denominated Akṣara (the Imperishable), *they say, is the supreme*, the most exalted, *goal. Having reached which* supreme Being (state) *none return* to saṁsāra (transmigratory life), *that* state (place, abode) *is My highest abode*, the exalted state (abode) of Viṣṇu.

The means to the acquisition of that state is now being stated:

पुरुषः स परःपार्थ भक्त्या लभ्यस्त्वनन्यया ।
यस्यान्तः स्थानि भूतानि येन सर्वमिदं ततम् ॥ २२ ॥

Puruṣaḥ sa paraḥ Pārtha bhaktyā-labhyas-
tvananyayā
Yasyāntaḥ-sthāni bhūtani yena sarvam-idaṁ tatam

22. And that supreme Puruṣa, in Whom all beings dwell and by Whom all this is pervaded, is attainable, O Pārtha, by exclusive devotion.

And that supreme Puruṣa—so called because He rests in the city ('puri', i.e. body) or because He is Infinite (pūrṇa). He is supreme, unsurpassed,—because there is nothing beyond Him. He *is attainable by exclusive devotion* i.e. Jñāna, the Knowledge concerning the Self (VII. 17). *In Whom*, in this Puruṣa, *all beings*, which are effects, *dwell*: they abide within Him, as verily does an effect within its cause; *and by Whom*, the Puruṣa, *all this* universe *is pervaded*, permeated, as pots etc. by space (ākāśa).

With regard to the yogins now being spoken of, who have devoted themselves to the contemplation of the *Praṇava* (Om) as Brahman, and who will attain release in due course of time, the northern path which they take for reaching Brahman needs

to be specified; and so, the sequel, "at what time" (VIII-23) etc. follows, setting out the matter intended to be taught. Mention is (also) made of the path of return, with the object of extolling the other path.

यत्र काले त्वनावृत्तिमावृत्तिं चैव योगिनः ।
प्रयाता यान्ति तं कालं वक्ष्यामि भरतर्षभ ॥ २३ ॥

Yatra kāle tvanāvṛttim-āvṛttim caiva yoginaḥ
Prayātā yānti tam kālaṃ vakṣyami Bharatarṣabha

23. O bull of the Bhāratas, I shall tell you, now, at what time (path) travelling (departing) yogins go to return not, as also to return.

The words, 'at what time (or in what path)' should be taken with 'travelling'. *O bull of the Bhāratas, I shall tell you, now, at what time (path), travelling* when dead, *yogins*, referring here to those engaged in meditation, and to those engaged in Karma (Karmins) also, in a secondary sense,—as they have been so referred to in the passage, 'the path of the work for the yogins (the active)' (III-3)—*go to return not*, that is, not to suffer any more rebirth, *as also to return*, which is the opposite. The purport is: I shall tell you of the time (path) travelling , or dying, in which yogins are not born again, and also of the time (path) travelling or dying, in which, they will suffer rebirth[15].

The Lord mentions the time (path):

अग्निर्ज्योतिरहः शुक्लः षण्मासा उत्तरायणम् ।
तत्र प्रयाता गच्छन्ति ब्रह्म ब्रह्मविदो जनाः ॥ २४ ॥

15. The distinction is that the yogins practising meditation go to return not while those engaged in Karma are to return. (Ā) Both these, i.e., the *dhyāna-gogins* and *karmins*, be it remembered, come after the *jñāna-yogins* (*Sāṃkhyas*) who are liberated even while appearing to be living in the world, and therefore have no such thing as the "departure" of their *prāṇa* (vital air) at the fall of the body. See end of Com. to the next verse.

Agnir-jyotir-ahaḥ śuklaḥ ṣaṇmāsā uttarāyaṇam
Tatra prayāta gacchanti Brahma Brahmavido janāḥ

24. Fire, Light, day-time, the bright fortnight, the six months of the northern passage of the sun,—departing in that, the knowers of Brahman go to Brahman.

Fire, a deity presiding over time, so also *Light*, another deity presiding over time;—or Fire (Agni) and Light (Jyoti) are the deities well-known (in Śruti) by those names; the references to the (entire) path (as time) in the expressions 'at what time', 'that time' (VIII-23) are due to the greater number (of deities presiding over time), just as we speak of (what consists predominantly of mango trees as) a mango-grove. *Day-time*, the deity presiding over the day-time, *the bright fortnight*, the deity presiding over the bright fortnight, *the six months of the northern passage of the sun*,—here also the deity which forms (a stage on) the path is meant. The reasoning (on which this interpretation, that the references are to deities, is based) has been extablished elsewhere (Br. Sū. IV.iii.4). *Departing*, after death, *in that path, the knowers o! Brahman*, those persons who have been devoted to the meditation of Brahman, *go to Brahman* in course of time—(this has to be understood).

For those established in True Knowledge (*samyag-darsana*), who attain immediate liberation, there is verily neither any going to, nor returning from, any place whatever, as stated in Śruti, "His life-breaths do not depart" (*Bṛ.IV-iv-6*); their vital airs merge in Brahman alone, i.e. they simply consist of Brahman and have become Brahman.

धूमो रात्रिस्तथा कृष्णः षण्मासा दक्षिणायनम् ।
तत्र चान्द्रमसं ज्योतिर्योगी प्राप्य निवर्तते ॥ २५ ॥

Dhūmo rātris-tathā kṛṣṇaḥ ṣaṇmāsā daksiṇāyanam
Tatra cāndramasam jyotir-yogī prāpya nivartate

25. Smoke, night-time, and the dark fortnight, the

six months of the southern passage of the sun—taking this path, the yogi attaining the lunar light returns.

Smoke, night-time, the deities presiding over smoke and night-time, *and the dark fortnight*, the deity presiding over the dark fortnight, *the six months of the southern passage of the sun*, referring also to the presiding deity, as in the previous instances; *taking this path, the yogi*, the karmin, performer of actions such as sacrifices *attaining the lunar light*, i.e. enjoying the fruit (of his actions there), *returns*, on its exhaustion[16].

शुक्लकृष्णे गती ह्येते जगतः शाश्वते मते ।
एकया यात्यनावृत्तिमन्ययाऽऽवर्तते पुनः ॥ २६ ॥

Śukla-kṛṣṇe gatī hyete jagataḥ śāsvate mate
Ekayā yātyanāvṛttim-anyayā(ā)vartate punaḥ

26. Truly are these bright and dark paths of the world considered eternal: man goes by the one to return not; by the other,he returns again.

Truly are the bright and dark paths,—the one is bright as there is illumination of Knowledge, and the other is dark because of the want of it,—*of the world*: they are open only to those (of the world) qualified for Knowledge or for action; and not for the entire world are the two paths possible (open);—*considered*, regarded as, *eternal*, constant[17], because saṁsāra is eternal. Of the two, *by the one*, the bright path, *man* goes *to return not*; *by the other* (i.e. the dark path), *he returns again.*

नैते सृती पार्थ जानन्योगी मुह्यति कश्चन ।
तस्मात्सर्वेषु कालेषु योगयुक्तो भवार्जुन ॥ २७ ॥

16. *Br. Sū*. III. i.8. (Ā)

17. The two paths are eternal, constant, as the fruits, respectively of devotion to Knowledge and devotion to action. If they were open to all the world indiscriminately, the teaching of the Scripture regarding Knowledge and action (as different) would be purposeless. (Ā)

Naite sṛtī Pārtha jānan-yogī muhyati kaścana
Tasmāt-sarveṣu kāleṣu yoga yukto bhavārjuna

27. After knowing these paths, O Pārtha, no yogi is deluded. Therefore, at all times, O Arjuna, be you steadfast in yoga.

O Pārtha, after knowing these paths, aforesaid, that one (of them) leads to saṁsāra and the other to liberation (mokṣa), *no yogi,* whosoever, *is deluded*[18]. *Therefore, at all times, O Arjuna, be you steadfast in yoga,* composed.

Now, hear of the greatness of Yoga.

वेदेषु यज्ञेषु तपस्सु चैव दानेषु यत्पुण्यफलं प्रदिष्टम् ।
अत्येति तत्सर्वमिदं विदित्वा योगी परं स्थानमुपैति चाद्यम् ॥२८॥

Vedeṣu yajñeṣu tapassu caiva dāneṣu yat-puṇya-phalam pradiṣṭam
Atyeti tat-sarvam-idam viditvā yogī param sthānam-upaiti cādyam

28. Whatever meritorious effect is declaredfo accrue from the Vedas, yajñās, austerities, and gifts—above it all, the yogi rises on knowing this (teaching), and attains to the primeval, supreme abode.

Whatever meritorious effect, fruit of meritorious action, *is declared* by Scripture *to accrue from the Vedas* having been studied correctly and properly, *from yajñās,* sacrifices, having been performed in all their parts, *from austerities* well practised, *and from gifts* well-given, *above it all,* above the entirety of the fruit (of studying the Vedas etc.), *the yogi rises on knowing this* (*teaching*), on having understood rightly what all has been stated (by the Lord)

18. As the yogi, devoted to meditation, has his mind on the path of Light, he is not deluded, that is to say, he does not, take to mere action which leads to the southern path. (A)

by way of settling the seven points (raised by Arjuna in the opening verse of the Chapter) and having followed them in practice, *and attains to the primeval*, that which exists from the beginning, the *supreme abode*, the exalted abode of Īśvara: he attains the Cause, Brahman.

इति श्रीमहाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्यां
भीष्मपर्वणि श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु
ब्रह्मविद्यायां योगशास्त्रे श्रीकृष्णार्जुन-
संवादे तारकब्रह्मयोगो नाम
अष्टमोऽध्यायः ॥

Iti Śrī-Mahābhārate śata-sāhasryām samhitāyām Vaiyāsikyām Bhīṣma-Parvani Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītāsūpaniṣatsu Brahma-vidyāyām yoga śāstre Śrī Kṛṣṇārjuna-samvāde Tāraka-brahma-yogo nāma aṣṭamo (a)dhyayaḥ.

Thus the eighth chapter entitled 'Saving Knowledge of Brahman[19]' in the Upaniṣads known as 'The Celebrated Songs of the Lord' expounding the knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna—embodied in the Bhīṣma-Parva of Śrī Mahābhārata the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyāsa.

19. This chapter is also designated as *Dhāraṇa-yoga*, *Abhyāsa-yoga*, and *Akṣara-Brahma-yoga* (Yoga of 'Collectedness' 'Constant Practice', and 'Imperishable Brahma' respectively.) In the bhāsya it is entitled, *Brahma kṣara-nirdeśaḥ* ("Instruction about Brahman").

॥ नवमोऽध्यायः ॥
(राजविद्या-राजगुह्य-योगः)

NAVAMO(A)DHYĀYAH

(*RĀJA-VIDYA—RĀJA-GUHYA-YOGAḤ*)

CHAPTER – IX

(YOGA OF KINGLY KNOWLEDGE AND KINGLY SECRET)

In the eighth chapter has been declared the *yoga* of concentration (*dhāraṇa-yoga*) through the *nādi*[1], together with the auxiliary means[2]. An, its result has been indicated as the very attainment, in due course, successively through 'fire', 'light' etc., of Brahman that is to say, non-return (to *saṁsāra*). Here, the doubt may arise that the fruit of *mokṣa* is attainable by this means alone, and not by any other. With a view to setting side this doubt,

श्रीभगवानुवाच—
इदं तु ते गुह्यतमं प्रवक्ष्याम्यनसूयवे ।
ज्ञानं विज्ञानसहितं यज्ज्ञात्वा मोक्ष्यसेऽशुभात् ॥ १ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvaca—

Idam tu te guhya-tamam pravakṣyāmyanasūyave
Jñānam vijñāna-sahitam yajjñātva mokṣyase(a) śubhāt

The Blessed Lord said—

1. To you, who do not carp, I shall now declare this, the most profound secret, (namely) Knowledge

1. The *suṣumna*. (Ā)
2. such as closing the gates. (VIII. 12, 13). (Ā)

combined with Realisation, having known which, you shall be free from evil.

To you, who do not carp, who are devoid of the carping spirit, *I shall now declare this*: the Knowledge of Brahman ("Brahma-jñāna") which is about to be declared, and which has been mentioned in the previous chapters, is presented to the mind and referred to as 'this'. The word 'now' is for the purpose of specifying its superiority[3]. This True Knowledge, samyag-jñāna) alone is the direct means to the attainment of mokṣa, as declared by Śruti and Smṛti, in such passages as:

"Vāsudeva is all" (VII-19);
"All this is the Self" (Ch. VII.xxv. 2);
"One only, without a second" (Ch. VI.ii.1.)

—and nothing else (is the direct means), as stated in passages of the Śruti such as the following:

"Now those who understand differently from this[4] become subjects of another lord and attain to perishable worlds" (Ch. VII. xxv.2).

(What I am going to tell you is) *the most profound secret*; it is to be superlatively guarded. What is it? *Knowledge*,. Of what description? *Combined with Realisation* (Vijñāna), personal experience[5], *on knowing which*, on obtaining which Knowledge, *you shall be free from evil*, *the* bondage of saṁsāra.

And it (that Knowledge) is

राजविद्या राजगुह्यं पवित्रमिदमुत्तमम् ।
प्रत्यक्षावगमं धर्म्यं सुसुखं कर्तुमव्ययम् ॥ २ ॥

Rāja-vidya rāja-guhyam pavitram-idam-uttamam
Pratyakṣāvagamam dharmyam susukham kartum-avyayam

3. i.e. the excellence of Knowledge (*jñāna*), over meditation (*dhyāna*). (Ā)
4. ("this" refers to) the perception of *advaita* (that all this is the Self.) (Ch. VII. xxv.2). (Ā)
5. intuitive (direct) perception (*anubhava-sākṣātkāra*). (Ā)

2. The kind of sciences, the sovereign secret—the supreme purifier is this; directly comprehensible, endowed with merit, very easy to perform, and imperishable.

The king of sciences: of sciences, it is the king, because of the pre-eminence of its splendour; indeed, this science of Brahman (Brahma-vidyā) is pre-eminently brilliant, among all sciences. So also, it is *the sovereign secret*, the king (highest) of profundities. *The supreme purifier is this*: this Brahma-jñāna is the best of purifiers, being the cleanser of all (other) purifiers. What more need be said of its purifying potentiality than this: that it reduces to ashes, just in an instant, all karma—dharma and adharma—even though accumulated during several thousands of births, with its root? Moreover, it is *directly comprehensible*; it can be comprehended by "pratyakṣa", by immediate perception, like the feeling of pleasure and the like. Even that which is endowed with many good qualities is often seen to be opposed to dharma; but the knowledge of the Self (atma-jñāna) is not so, (i.e. is not) opposed to dharma; it is on the other hand, *endowed with merit*, not deviating from dharma. Being so, it may be doubted that it may be difficult to acquire; therefore, the Lord says: it is *very easy to perform*, very easy to acquire, like the capacity to discriminate gems[6]. Now, it is seen with respect to acts which involve little effort, and can be effected with ease, that the results are trivial; and that in the case of those (acts) which are difficult to perform, the result is immense; and so, it may be supposed that this (Brahma-jñāna), being easy to acquire, will disappear when its result is exhausted. As to this, the Lord says—it is *imperishable*: for it, there is no disappearance due to exhaustion of result, as is the case with karma (action). Wherefore, Knowledge of the Self is to be strongly desired, with faith.

But, they—

अश्रद्दधानाः पुरुषा धर्मस्यास्य परन्तप ।
अप्राप्य मां निवर्तन्ते मृत्युसंसारवर्त्मनि ॥ ३ ॥

6. This (discriminating gems) is easily acquired when taught by an adept; so is *Brahma-jñāna*. (Ā)

Arśaddhādhānāḥ puruṣaḥ dharmasyāsya parantapa
Aprāpya mām nivartante mṛtyu-saṁsāra-vartmani

3. Persons without *śraddha* for this dharma, O scorcher of foes, return, without attaining Me, in the path of the mortal world.

Persons without sraddha for this dharma (discipline) of Self-knowledge, those who do not believe in its existence or its effect, the sinful who hold the doctrine of the asuras (demons) that the body alone is the self, and gratify the senses,—*O scorcher of foes*—, they, *without attaining Me*, the Supreme Lord (Parameśvara):—their reaching Me is quite out of the question; wherefrom it is to be understood by implication that they do not acquire even mere devotion (bhakti) which is one of the different paths of attaining to Me,—they *return*, certainly go round and round; where? *in the path of the mortal world*, the path of transmigration which is fraught with death, the path which leads to hell (naraka) and birth as animal etc.; in that path alone they remain.

Having made Arjuna look forward to the teaching, by extolling it, the Lord proceeds:

मया ततमिदं सर्वं जगदव्यक्तमूर्तिना ।
मत्स्थानि सर्वभूतानि न चाहं तेष्ववस्थितः ॥ ४ ॥

Mayā tatam-idam sarvam jagad-avyaktam-mūrtinā
Mat-sthāni sarva-bhūtani na cāham teṣvavasthitaḥ

4. By Me, in My unmanifested form, is all this world pervaded. All beings exist in Me; but I do not dwell in them.

By Me, by My higher Being, *in My unmanifested form*, by Me, whose form—nature—is not perceivable, that is to say, not comprehensible to the senses, *is all this world pervaded. All beings*, from Brahma down to a clump of grass, *exist in Me* of that un-

manifested form. Verily, it is not possible for any object, devoid of a 'self', to become the subject of (for) worldly affair (common experience or any business). Therefore, they exist in Me: they are existing with self-hood, with Me, (as) the Self; and hence they are said to exist in Me. Because I am Myself the Self of all those beings, it appears to men of deluded intellect as if I dwell in them; wherefore, I declare: *but I do not dwell in them*, in those beings,—because of the absence of contract, such as is the case with objects having form. I am indeed the innermost being of even the ākāśa (which is subtle and formless). And, surely, that thing which is unconnected (with anything) cannot be said to rest (or stay) anywhere, as if it were kept in a receptacle.

Wherefore, because of My non-connection (with anything)—

न च मत्स्थानि भूतानि पश्य मे योगमैश्वरम् ।
भूतभृन्न च भूतस्थो ममात्मा भूतभावनः ॥ ५ ॥

Na ca mat-sthāni bhūtani paśya me yogam-aiśvaram
Bhūtabhrunna ca bhūtastho mamātma bhūta-bhāvanah

5. Nor do beings exist in Me; behold My divine *Yoga*! Supporting (all) beings, but not dwelling in them, is My Self, the cause of all beings.

Nor do beings exist in Me, the beings from Brahma downwards; *behold My divine Yoga*! (behold) My scheme of functioning, this Yoga pertaining to Me, the Lord (Īśvara),—meaning, the inherent nature of the Self. And thus, Śruti also declares the unattached state (of the Self) because of Its being unconnected with anything: "Devoid of contact, He is never attached". (Bṛ III.ix.26). Behold also this, another mystery. *Supporting (all) beings*: even though remaining unattached, (My Self) supports (all) beings, *but not dwelling in them*; Its dwelling in beings being incompatible, as shown by the reasoning afore-mentioned[7]. How

7. i.e. because of Its being un-connected (IX-4. Com.). (Ā)

then is this said: " *My Self*"? The Lord speaks of It as My Self, following the conception of common people which differentiates the aggregate of the body etc. (from the Self) and superimposes the ego on that (aggregate). He does not really speak of the Self (Ātman) as different from Himself, through ignorance, as common people do. So also, *the Cause of beings*, making them come into existence, or making them grow.

What has been stated in the two preceding verses, the Lord demonstrates by an illustration, and says:

यथाऽऽकाशस्थितो नित्यं वायुः सर्वत्रगो महान् ।
तथा सर्वाणि भूतानि मत्स्थानीत्युपधारय ॥ ६ ॥

Yathā(ā)kāśa-sthito nityam vāyuḥ sarvatrago mahān
Tathā sarvāṇi bhūtani mat-sthānītyupadhāraya

6. As the great wind, moving everywhere, rests ever in the ākāśa, know that even so do all beings rest in Me.

As, in common experience, it is seen that *the great wind*, (vāyu), mighty in expanse, moving everywhere, *rests ever*, always *in the ākāśa* (space), *know that even so*, in like manner, *do all beings rest*, without any contact, *in Me*, Who am all-pervading like the ākāśa.

All beings which thus rest in Me during the life-time of the universe, as air rests in the ākāśa, they—

सर्वभूतानि कौन्तेय प्रकृतिं यान्ति मामिकाम् ।
कल्पक्षये पुनस्तानि कल्पादौ विसृजाम्यहम् ॥ ७ ॥

Sarva-bhūtani Kaunteya prakṛtim yānti māmikām
Kalpa-kṣaye punas-tāni kalpādau visṛjāmyaham

7. All beings, O son of Kuntī, go into My *Prakṛti*,

at the end of a kalpa; at the beginning of the (next) kalpa, I send them forth again.

All beings, O son of Kunti, go into My Prakṛti, the inferior one composed of the three gunas, *at the end of the kalpa,* at the time of dissolution (pralaya). Again, *at the beginning of the (next) kalpa,* the cosmic manifestation (utpatti), *I send them forth,* I produce those beings, *again,* once more, as previously.

Prakṛti is of the nature of nescience (*avidyā*). Thus,

प्रकृतिं स्वामवष्टभ्य विसृजामि पुनः पुनः ।
भूतग्राममिमं कृत्स्नमवशं प्रकृतेर्वशात् ॥ ८ ॥

Prakṛtim svām-avaṣṭabhya visṛjāmi punaḥ-punaḥ
Bhūta-grāmam-imam kṛtsnam-avaśam prakṛter-vaśāt

8. Resorting to My Prakrti, I project again and again this whole multitude of beings, (which is) helpless under the sway of Prakṛti.

Resorting to My Prakṛti, having under control Prakṛti, which is mine own, *I project again and again this whole multitude of beings,* the collection of beings we now perceive to have sprung from Prakṛti, *helpless,* reduced to subjection by avidyā and other troubles[8], *under the sway of Pṛakrti,* due to their svabhavā (nature).

Then, to Thee, the Parameśvara Who creates this multitude of beings in an unequal manner, will there not be connection with dharma and adharma arising from that (act of creation)?

In reply, the Lord says—

न च मां तानि कर्माणि निबध्नन्ति धनञ्जय ।
उदासीनवदासीनमसक्तं तेषु कर्मसु ॥ ९ ॥

8. Vide note 12, Chap. VIII.

Na ca mām tāni karmāṇi nibadhnanti Dhanañjaya
Udāsīnavad-āsīnam-asaktam teṣu karmasu

9. These acts do not bind Me, sitting as one neutral, unattached to those acts, O Dhanañjaya.

These acts, which occasion the unequal creation of the multitude of beings, *do not bind Me*, the Lord, *O Dhanañjaya*. Now, the Lord states the reason for His non-connection with those acts. I am *sitting as one neutral*: since the Self is immutable, I (the Self) remain like a neutral, who is indifferent; *unattached to those acts*, devoid of attachment ot the fruit of those acts and of the self-conceit that I do them.

From this, it follows that, for any other person also, the absence of self-conceit that he is the agent (of an act) and (absence) of attachment to the fruit, is the cause of freedom from bondage; if he is otherwise, that ignorant man is bound by (his) acts as is the silkworm in its cocoon.

Now, the statements, "I project this multitude of beings" (XI-8) and "sitting as one neutral" (IX-9) are inconsistent: to remove the contradiction, the Lord says. :

मयाऽध्यक्षेण प्रकृतिः सूयते सचराचरम् ।
हेतुनाऽनेन कौन्तेय जगद्विपरिवर्तते ।। १० ।।

Mayā(a)dhyakṣeṇa prakṛtiḥ sūyate sa-caracaram
Hetunā(a)nena Kaunteya jagad-viparivartate

10. With Me presiding, *Prakṛti* produces the moving and the un-moving; because of this, O son of Kunti the world keeps going round.

With Me presiding, as a mere witness (looker-on) on every side, and immutable in nature, *Prakrti*, My Māyā, consisting of the three guṇas and being of the nature of nescience (avidya), *produces* the universe, comprising *the moving and the un-moving*. The Vedic mantra says so:

"The One Effulgent, hidden in all beings, all-pervading, the inner-Self of all beings, the Superintendent of all acts, abiding in all beings, the Witness, the Knower, the Absolute and devoid of qualities". (Śv. VI.II).

Because of this, My being the witness, presiding over (Māyā), *O son of Kunti, the world comprising* the moving and the un-moving, the manifested and the un-manifested, *keeps going round*, through all states[9].

Indeed, it is only by reason of forming the object of comprehension by a perceiver (cognising witness) that all activity of the world arises such as 'I shall enjoy this', 'I see this', 'I hear this', 'I experience this pleasure', 'I experience sorrow', 'I shall do this for that purpose', 'I shall do this for this purpose,' 'I shall learn (about) this',: all these are based on knowledge, (comprehension) and have their termination in knowledge. This very import is indicated in the mantras such as "Who in the supreme ākāśa[10] is the witness of this" (R.V.-X. 129.). And, therefore[11], it is irrelevant to ask, or to reply to, the question, "What is the purpose of this creation by the One divine Being, the all witnessing pure Consciousness, when He (Himself) has, in reality, no concern for any enjoyment whatever, and there is also no other conscious being and consequently no (other) separate enjoyer?"—for, so says the Vedic mantra: "Who could know It directly, and who could declare whence this (world) was born and why this manifold creation?"[12] (R.V.X.129.6). The Lord has also declared: "Knowledge is enveloped in ignorance; hence do beings get deluded." (V. 15)[13].

I am thus Eternal, Pure, Wise, and Free, by nature, and the Self of all beings. Nevertheless,

9. i.e. the three states of projection, sustenance and dissolution (*sṛṣti*, *sthiti* and *saṁhāra*). (A)

10. of the heart. (A)

11. Because Īśvara is merely the witness with respect to His creation. (Ā)

12. This *Śruti* points to the difficulty of knowing the Supreme Self, and the where from of this manifold creation. (Ā)

13. The idea of creation is thus due to *ajñāna* (nescience). (Ā)

अवजानन्ति मां मूढा मानुषीं तनुमाश्रितम् ।
परं भावमजानन्तो मम भूतमहेश्वरम् ॥ ११ ॥

Avajānanti mām mūdhā mānuṣīm tanum-aśritam
Param bhāvam-ajānanto mama bhūta-mahesvaram

11. Fools disregard Me, dwelling in human form, unaware of My higher state as the great Lord of beings.

Fools, those wanting in discrimination, *disregard Me*, have a low opinion of, show disrespect, to , Me, *dwelling in human form*, that is to say, engaging in affairs with a human body, *unaware of My higher state*, not understanding that I am the exalted Reality that is the Supreme Self, Who, being like the ākāśa, (nay, is) even more intimate than even the ākāśa, *as the great Lord*, the very Self *of all beings*. And thus by continually disregarding Me these pitiable wretches are ruined.

How (are they pitiable wretches)?

मोघाशा मोघकर्माणो मोघज्ञाना विचेतसः ।
राक्षसीमासुरीं चैव प्रकृतिं मोहिनीं श्रिताः ॥ १२ ॥

Moghāśa mogha-karmāṇo mogha-jñānā vicetasaḥ
Rakṣasīm-āsurīm caiva prakṛtim mohinīm śritaḥ

12. Of vain hopes, of vain works, of vain knowledge, and senseless, they verily are possessed of the delusive nature of *rākṣasas* and *asuras*.

Of vain hopes, the hopes they cherish are to no purpose; *of vain works*, similarly, their actions—agnihotra and others performed by them—become fruitless actions, because of their humiliating the Lord and showing contempt for Him, their own Self; so also, *of vain knowledge*, even their knowledge turns out to be useless; *and senseless*,—the import is that they are deprived of discrimina-

tion. Moreover, *they are possessed of the delusive nature*, that which causes delusion, namely, holding to the doctrine that the body itself is the self, *of rākṣasas and asuras*, and engage in cruel deeds, uttering the words, 'cut', 'break', 'drink', 'eat', 'take others' property' and the like[14]. Sruti also declares, "their words are indeed demoniac". (Īśā.3).

On the other hand, they who have faith and engage themselves on the path to *mokṣa*, characterised by devotion (*bhakti*) to the Lord.

महात्मानस्तु मां पार्थ दैवीं प्रकृतिमाश्रिताः ।
भजन्त्यनन्यमनसो ज्ञात्वा भूतादिमव्ययम् ॥ १३ ॥

Mahātmānastu mām Pārtha daivīm prakrtim-āśritah
Bhajanty ananya-manaso jñātva bhūtādim-avyayam

13. But the great-souled ones, O Pārtha, possessed of divine nature, worship Me with a single mind, knowing Me to be the origin of beings and immutable.

But the great souled ones, those who are not mean-minded O Pārtha, being *possessed of divine nature*, the nature of the gods (devas), characterised by control over the body, mind and senses, (and also by) compassion, faith, etc., *worship*, resort to, *Me*, the Lord (Īśvara) *with a single mind*, with their mind turned to nothing else, *knowing*[15] *Me to be the origin of* all *beings*, the primeval cause of the elements, ākāśa and others, and of all living creatures as well, *and immutable*.

14. The word 'moreover' denotes that it is not merely that, in their present bodies, they are of the nature stated; it is certain that, after death, they will be born as hard-hearted beings. The nature of *rākṣasas* consists in cruelty to beings, signified by the words, 'cut' break, drink, eat'; and the nature of asuras is to rob another of his property, not to make gifts, and not to perform sacri fices. (Ā)

15. Since it is not possible to resort to a person without knowing him, they first know Me through scripture (*śāstra*) and reasoning (*upapatti*), and then resort to Me. (Ā)

How (do they worship)?

सततं कीर्तयन्तो मां यतन्तश्च दृढव्रताः ।
नमस्यन्तश्च मां भक्त्या नित्ययुक्ता उपासते ॥ १४ ॥

Satatam kīrtayanto mām yatantaśca dṛḍha-vratāḥ
Namasyantaśca mām bhaktyā nitya-yuktā upāsate

14. Always glorifying Me and striving with firm resolve, bowing to Me in devotion, always steadfast, they worship Me.

Always glorifying Me, the Lord (Bhagavān), the very Brahman, *and striving*, through subjugation of the senses, control of the mind and body cultivating compassion and harmlessness and other virtues, *with firm resolve*, steady in their resolve (or vows) *bowing* down *to Me*, the Lord the Self, lying in the heart, *in devotion*, remaining *always steadfast, they worship, resort to, Me.*

The Lord speaks of the different ways in which they worship;

ज्ञानयज्ञेन चाप्यन्ये यजन्तो मामुपासते ।
एकत्वेन पृथक्त्वेन बहुधा विश्वतोमुखम् ॥ १५ ॥

Jñāna-yajñena cāpyanye yajanto mām-upāsate
Ekatvena pṛthaktvena bahudhā viśvatomukham

15. Sacrificing by the *yajña* of Knowledge, others too adore Me, the All-faced, as one, as distinct, as, manifold.

Sacrificing, worshipping, *by the yajña of Knowledge*: Knowledge about the Lord is itself sacrifice; by this, *others too*[16] *adore Me*, the Lord (Īśvara), abandoning all other forms of worship. (And that knowledge is of different kinds). Some worship Me *as one*

16. Refers to *Brahma-niṣṭhas*, those devoted to Brahman. (Ā)

with the knowledge of the real (supreme) Truth that 'One, verily is the Supreme Brahman'. And, some worship *as distinct*, the Sun, the Moon, etc., with the knowledge that He alone, the Lord Visnu, exists in the forms of the Sun,and the others. Some worship Him, the *All-faced*, Who exists in all forms (viśva-rūpa), with His face on all sides, *as manifold*, thinking that He alone, the Lord, exists in all forms, with His face on all sides.

If they worship in many different ways, how can it be said that they worship Thee alone? On this, the Lord says:

अहं क्रतुरहं यज्ञः स्वधाऽहमौषधम् ।
मन्त्रोऽहमहमेवाज्यमहमग्निरहं हुतम् ॥ १६ ॥

Aham kratur-aham yajñaḥ svadhā(a)ham-aham-auṣadham
Mantro(a)ham-ahamevājyam-aham agnir-aham hutam

16. I alone am the *kratu*, I the *yajña*, I the *svadhā*, I the *auṣadha*, I the *mantra*, I the *ājyam*, I the fire, and I the oblation.

I alone am the kratu, a class of Vedic sacrifices; *I am the yajña*, enjoined by Smṛti; besides, I am *the svadhā*, the food that is offered to the manes (*Pitṛs*); *I am the auṣadha*, that which is eaten by all living beings. Or, svadha is the food in general eaten by all living beings; and auṣadha is the medicinal food taken for the alleviation of disease. *I am the mantra*, the sacred text with which the oblation is offered to the manes and gods (devatās); *I* am *the ājyam*, the material offered ; *I* Myself am *the fire* into which the offering is made; *and I* am also *the oblation*, the act of offering in the fire.

Besides,

पिताऽहमस्य जगतो माता धाता पितामहः ।
वेद्यं पवित्रमोङ्कार ऋक्साम यजुरेव च ॥ १७ ॥

Pitā(a)ham-asya jagato mātā dhātā pitāmahaḥ
Vedyam pavitram-omkara ṛk-sāma yajur eva ca

17. I am the Father of the world, the Mother, the Supporter, the Grandfather, the one (thing) to be known, the Purifier, the syllable Om, and also the *Ṛk*, *Sāman* and *Yajus*.

I am the Father, the progenitor, of this world; *the Mother*, she who begets; *the Supporter*, who dispenses the fruits of action to living beings; *the Grand-father* of the father; *the one thing to be known, the Purifier*, that which frees from sin; *the syllable Om*; *and also the Ṛk, Sāman and Yajus.*

And,

गतिर्भर्ता प्रभुः साक्षी निवासः शरणं सुहृत् ।
प्रभवः प्रलयः स्थानं निधानं बीजमव्ययम् ॥ १८ ॥

Gatir-bhartā prabhuḥ sākṣī nivāsaḥ śaraṇam suhṛt
Prabhavaḥ pralayaḥ sthānam nidhanam bījam-avyayam

18. The Goal, the Sustainer, the Lord, the Witness, the Abode, the Refuge, the Well-wisher, the Origin, Dissolution and Stay, the Store-house, the Seed imperishable.

I am *the Goal*, the fruit of action; *the Sustainer*, who nourishes; *the Lord*, the Owner, *the Witness* of what is done and what is not done by living beings; *the Abode* wherein all living beings dwell; *the Refuge*, who relieves the distressed who resort to Me from (their) distress; I am *the Well-wisher*, who does good without expecting any service in return; I am *the Origin*, from which the universe springs up, the *Dissolution*, into which it disappears, and *Stay*, in which it stands; *the Store-house*, the deposit (of karmas in subtle form) which living beings shall enjoy at a future time; I am *the Seed imperishable*, that which causes the sprouting of all

things which germinate; and which is imperishable, enduring as long as saṁsāra (the world) lasts. Indeed nothing springs up without seed; and since sprouting (offspring) is seen eternally, it is clear that the continuity of the seed is never lost.

And also.

तपाम्यहमहं वर्षं निगृह्णाम्युत्सृजामि च ।
अमृतं चैव मृत्युश्च सदसच्चाहमर्जुन ॥ १९ ॥

Tapāmyaham-aham varṣam nigṛhṇāmyutsṛjāmi ca
Amṛtam caiva mṛtyuśca sādasaccāham-Arjuna

19. I give heat; I withhold and send forth the rain; I am immortality and also death; the being and the non-being am I, O Arjuna!

I give heat: as the Sun, I give heat by some strong rays; by some rays, *I send forth the rain*, and having sent forth (the rain) I *withhold* it, capture it again by some rays during eight months, and again send it forth in the rainy season. *I am* the *immortality* of the gods (devas) *and also* the *death* of mortals. I am *the being*, the manifested (effect) which manifests itself in relation (to the cause), and *the non-being*, the reverse[17], *am I, O Arjuna*!

In truth, however, the Lord is not, in Himself, absolutely non-existent; nor can the effect and the cause be respectively said to be 'being' and 'non-being'.[18]

The men of knowledge who adore Me, worshipping Me through 'sacrifices' according to the modes mentioned above, i.e. with the

17. The cause, the un-manifested in name and form, is called 'non-being' (*asat*): and the effect which manifests in relation to that cause is called 'being' (*sat*). (Ā)

18. 'Being' and 'non-being' have been used (in the verse) as related terms, referring to the manifested effect and the un-manifested cause. The effect is, in truth, not absolute 'being'—because all effects are mere name and form (Ch. VI.i.4-6); nor is the cause absolute 'non-being'—because of the impossibility of existence coming out of non-existence. (Ch. VI.ii.2). (Ā)

knowledge that I am One or that I am distinct,—they reach Myself alone according to their knowledge.

But those who are ignorant and long for objects of desire—

त्रैविद्या मां सोमपाः पूतपापा
यज्ञैरिष्ट्वा स्वर्गतिं प्रार्थयन्ते।
ते पुण्यमासाद्य सुरेन्द्रलोक-
मश्नन्ति दिव्यान्दिवि देवभोगान् ॥ २० ॥

Traividyā mām somapāḥ pūta-pāpā
Yajñair-iṣṭvā svargatim prārthayante

Te puñyam-āsādya surendra-lokam-
aśnanti divyān-divi deva bhogān

20. The knowers of the three Vedas[19], drinking *soma* and being purified from sin, worship Me by *yajña* and pray for passage to heaven; reaching the holy world of the Lord of the devas, they enjoy in heaven the divine pleasures of the devas.

The knowers of the three Vedas, Ṛk, Yajus and the Sāman, *drinking soma, and being purified from sin*, by that very drinking of the soman-juice (offered in the sacrifice), *worship Me*, in the form of vasus and the other gods, *by yajña*, sacrifices such as the Agniṣṭoma, *and pray for passage to heaven*, attainment of heaven (svarga), (their goal). And, *reaching* as the fruit of their good deeds, *the holy world of the Lord of the devas*, the abode of Indra who had performed a hundred sacrifices, *they enjoy in heaven the*

19. The reference is to the *Karma-Kānda* (Works Portion) alone of the Vedas, which forms the bulk of them.

divine, extra-ordinary (aprākṛta, super-natural) *pleasures of the devas*, gods.

ते तं भुक्त्वा स्वर्गलोकं विशालं
क्षीणे पुण्ये मर्त्यलोकं विशन्ति ।
एवं त्रयीधर्ममनुप्रपन्ना
गतागतं कामकामा लभन्ते ॥ २१ ॥

Te tam bhuktvā svarga-lokam viśālam
kṣīṇe puṇye martya-lokam viśanti

Evam trayī-dharmam-anuprapannā
gatāgatam kāmakāmā labhante

21. Having enjoyed the vast svarga-world, they enter the mortal world, on the exhaustion of their merit: thus, abiding by the injunctions of the three (Vedas), desiring desires, they come and go.

Having enjoyed the vast, extensive, *svarga-world, they enter the mortal world*, this (world of mortals), *on the exhaustion of their merit* (*punya*). *Thus*, verily, in the manner stated, *abiding by the injunctions of the three* Vedas, i.e. following mere Vedic ritual, *desiring desires*, longing for objects of enjoyment, *they come and go*, they have to go (to another world) and return (to this world)—that is to say, they never get freedom anyway.

Now, with regard to the men of Right Knowledge, who are devoid of desires—

अनन्याश्चिन्तयन्तो मां ये जनाः पर्युपासते ।
तेषां नित्याभियुक्तानां योगक्षेमं वहाम्यहम् ॥ २२ ॥

Ananyāś-cintayanto mām ye janāḥ paryupasate
Teṣām nityābhiyuktānām yoga-kṣemam
vahāmyaham

22. Those persons who, meditating on Me as non-separate, worship Me all round, to them who are ever-devoted, I carry gain and security.

Those persons, saṁnyāsins—men of renunciation—*who, meditating on Me as non-separate*, holding themselves as non-separate (from Me), understanding that the Supreme Lord, Nārāyaṇa is their very Self, *worship Me all round*[20], *to them*, those persons who perceive the Supreme Truth, *who are ever-devoted I carry gain and security*: I secure to them both gain (yoga), i.e.' getting what is not already possessed, and security (kṣema), i.e., preservation of what comes into possession. Since "the wise man, I regard as My Self " (VII-18), "And he is dear to Me" (VII-17), therefore, they form My own Self, and are dear to Me.

Objection—Does not the Lord carry gain and security for other devotees as well?

Reply—True, He does certainly carry (gain and security for them also); but there is this difference. They, the other devotees, themselves also endeavour for their own gain and security; whereas those who perceive non-separateness do not endeavour for their own gain and security. In fact, they never entertain any desire or concern even for their own life or death; they simply have the Lord alone as their resort; wherefore, the Lord Himself carries gain and security for them.

Question—If even other gods (devatās) are Thyself alone, do not the devotees of those gods worship Thyself?

Reply—True, it is so;

येऽप्यन्यदेवताभक्ता यजन्ते श्रद्धयान्विताः ।
तेऽपि मामेव कौन्तेय यजन्त्यविधिपूर्वकम् ॥ २३ ॥

20. i.e. perceive Me on all sides, everywhere, as unlimited. (Ā)

Ye(a)pynya-devatā-bhaktā yajante
śraddhayānritāḥ
Te(a)pi mām-eva Kaunteya yajantyavidhi-pūrvakam

23. Even those devotees of other gods who worship (them), endowed with *śraddhā*, they too worship Me alone, O son of Kuntī, (but) by the wrong method.

Even those devotees of other gods, who worship (them) endowed with śraddhā, having belief (in the efficiency of the worship), *they too worship Me alone, O son of Kunti, (but) by the wrong method,* i.e. attended with ignorance (ajñāna).

Why is it said that they worship by the wrong method (in ignorance)?

For,

अहं हि सर्वयज्ञानां भोक्ता च प्रभुरेव च।
न तु मामभिजानन्ति तत्त्वेनातश्च्यवन्ति ते ॥ २४ ॥

Aham hi sarva-yajñānām bhoktā ca prabhur-eva ca
Na tu mām-abhijānanti tattvenātaś-cyavanti te

24. I am indeed the Enjoyer and the Lord of all yajñas; but they do not know Me in reality; therefore, they slip.

I am indeed the Enjoyer and the Lord of all yajnas, of the sacrifices enjoined by Śruti and Smṛti, being the deity concerned (devatā) in every sacrifice.[21] Yajña indeed has Myself as its Lord, as stated already, "I Myself am the Adhiyajña here" (VIII-4) *But, they do not know Me in reality,* truly as I am, in the manner.

21. I am Myself the enjoyer of all *yajnas* as I am the Vasus, Ādityas, Indra and other deities (to whom sacrifices are offered). And, I Myself am the Lord of sacrifices, in My natural form as the *Antaryamin* (the Inner Controller). (Ā)

stated. *Therefore*, having worshipped in the wrong way (in ingorance), *they slip*, fall from the fruit of the sacrifice[22].

Even to them, who, through their devotion to other gods, worship Me by the wrong method (i.e. in ignorance), the fruit of (their) sacrifice certainly accrues. How is that?

यान्ति देवव्रता देवान्पितॄन्यान्ति पितृव्रताः।
भूतानि यान्ति भूतेज्या यान्ति मद्याजिनोऽपि माम् ॥ २५ ॥

Yānti devavratā devān pitṛn-yānti pitṛ-vratāḥ
Bhūtāni yānti bhūtejyā yānti mad-yājino(a)pt mām

25. Votaries of the devas go to the devas; to the *Pitṛs* go their votaries; to the *Bhūtas* go the Bhūta-worshippers; My votaries too come unto Me.

Votaries of the devas (gods)—those whose vows (religious observances) and devotion are directed to the gods, *go to the devas*; *to the Pitṛs*, the Agniṣvāttas and others, *go their votaries*—those who are devoted to the Pitṛs and engage themselves in the performance of śrāddhā and other rites; *to the Bhūtas*, i.e., to the Vināyakas, the group of divine mothers the four Bhaginīs, and the like, *go the Bhūta-worshippers*; *My votaries too come unto Me*—those who worship Me, the devotees of Viṣṇu come only to Myself. Though (in all these cases) the effort is the same, they (who worship.

22. Those who do not know Me truly, i.e. as the Enjoyer and the Lord of all sacrifices, do not dedicate their actions to Me owing to that ignorance, and hence fall from the fruit of their action. (Ā) i.e. from the region to which they go as a result of their sacrifice, they return after the exhaustion of that result.

Though it is usually held that the fruit of a *yajña* is the attainment of the world of the devatā worshipped, the Commentator, in line with the view of the Author of the *Gita*, considers that the *real* fruit is only *citta-śuddhi* (the purification of the mind), which qualifies the worshipper for the acquisition of *jñana*, conferring non-return to *saṃsāra*; and this real fruit can be had only when the worshipper gives up the desire for the "usual fruit". This is made clear in what follows, where the fruit is referred to in its usual connotation·

others' fail to worship Me directly, through (their) ignorance; and therefore they become enjoyers of trifling results.

Not only do my devotees obtain inexhaustible fruit, namely, non-return (to worldly existence), but I am also easy to propitiate How?

पत्रं पुष्पं फलं तोयं यो मे भक्त्या प्रयच्छति ।
तदहं भक्त्युपहृतमश्नामि प्रयतात्मनः ॥ २६ ॥

Patram puṣpam phalam toyam yo me bhaktyā prayacchati

Tad-aham bhaktyuaphṛtam-aśnāmi prayatātmanaḥ

26. Whoever, with devotion, offers Me a leaf, a flower, a fruit, or water, that I enjoy, the devout gift of the purified soul.

Whoever, with devotion, offers Me a leaf, a flower, a fruit, or water that—the leaf and the rest—*I enjoy*, accept, *the devout gift of the purified soul*, brought to Me, attended with devotion by the man of pure mind.

Because of this, therefore—

यत्करोषि यदश्नासि यज्जुहोषि ददासि यत् ।
यत्तपस्यसि कौन्तेय तत्कुरुष्व मदर्पणम् ॥ २७ ॥

Yat-karoṣi yad-aśnāsi yaj-juhoṣi dadāsi yat

Yat-tapasyasi Kaunteya tat-kuruṣva mad-arpaṇam

27. Whatever you do, whatever you eat, whatever you offer in sacrifice, whatever you give away, whatever austerity you practise, O son of Kunti, do that as an offering unto Me.

Whatever you do of your own accord[23], *whatever you eat*, and *whatever you offer in sacrifice*, as oblation, according to the injunction of the Śruti or the Smṛti, *whatever*, such as gold, food, ghee, and the like, *you give away* to brāhmaṇas and others, *whatever austerity you practise, O son of Kuntī, do that as an offering unto Me.*

Now, learn (from Me) what happens to you by so doing:

शुभाशुभफलैरेवं मोक्ष्यसे कर्मबन्धनैः ।
संन्यासयोगयुक्तात्मा विमुक्तो मामुपैष्यसि ॥ २८ ॥

Śubhāśubhā-phalair-evam mokṣyase karma-bandhanaiḥ
Saṁnyāsa-yoga-yuktātmā vimukto mām-upaiṣyasi

28. Thus shall you be freed from the bond of actions, productive of good and evil results; with the mind steadfast in the *Yoga* of Renunciation, and liberated, you shall come unto Me.

Thus, by offering your actions to Me, *shall you be freed from the bond of actions, productive of good and evil results*: actions themselves are the bondage and lead to desirable and undesirable results. This act of offering everything to Me is the Yoga of Renunciation: it is renunciation (saṁnyāsa), because everything is consigned to Me; and it is yoga as well, because it is an activity (karma). *With the mind* (ātmā = antaḥ-karaṇa) *steadfast in the* aforesaid *Yogas of Renunciation*, being of such a mind, *and liberated* from the bond of actions even while living (in the body), *you shall come unto Me* when this body drops away.

Objection—Then, the Lord has (the feelings of) affection and hatred, out of which He favours (His) devotees and not others?

Reply—It is not so:

23. i.e. not on account of any scriptural injunction,—namely, acts such as walking. (Ā)

समोऽहं सर्वभूतेषु न मे द्वेष्योऽस्ति न प्रियः ।
ये भजन्ति तु मां भक्त्या मयि ते तेषु चाप्यहम् ॥ २९ ॥

Samo(a)ham sarva-bhūteṣu na me dveṣyo(a)sti na priyaḥ
Ye bhajanti tu mām bhaktyā mayi te teṣu cāpyaham

29. The same I am to all beings; to Me there is none hateful or dear. But those who worship Me with devotion are in Me, and I too am in them.

The same, equal, impartial, *I am to all beings*; *to Me there is none hateful or dear.* I am like fire; just as fire does not remove chillness from those who stay way at a distance, but removes it from those who draw near to it, even so do I bestow grace on (My) devotees, but not on others. *But those who worship Me*, the Lord (Īśvara), *with devotion*, *are in Me*, as a matter of course, and not due to any affection on My part: *and I too am in them*, quite as a matter of course; (but) not in others; by this, I am not(to be understood as) showing dislike towards them[24].

Now hear about the glory of devotion to Me:

अपि चेत्सुदुराचारो भजते मामनन्यभाक् ।
साधुरेव स मन्तव्यः सम्यग्व्यवसितो हि सः ॥ ३० ॥

Api cet-sudurācāro bhajate mām-ananyabhāk
Sādhur-eva sa mantavyaḥ samyag-vyavasito hi saḥ

24. Those who worship Me by performing the duties of their caste and order, by reason of that very worship of inconceivable virtue, become pure in mind (*buddhi*) and close to Me; their minds become fit for My manifestation. And I, naturally being close to them, become favourable to them. Even as sun's light, though all-pervasive, is reflected (only) in a clean mirror, the Lord (also) unexceptionally appears in those persons whose minds (*sattva*) have been rid of all taints through devotion. And of them has it been said: "possessed of divine nature, they worship Me" (IX-13). (Ā)

30. If one, even of very wicked conduct, worships me with undivided devotion, he should be regarded as good, for he has rightly resolved.

If one, even of very wicked conduct, of extremely despicable behaviour, *worships Me with undivided devotion, he should be regarded*, understood, *as good*, as a person of right conduct; *for he has rightly*, properly, *resolved*: he has made a virtuous resolution.

And, by the power of the virtuous resolution made internally (i.e. in the mind), he abandons improper conduct in (his) external life—

क्षिप्रं भवति धर्मात्मा शश्वच्छान्तिं निगच्छति ।
कौन्तेय प्रतिजानीहि न मे भक्तः प्रणश्यति ॥ ३१ ॥

Kṣipram bhavati dharmātmā śaśvacchāntim nigacchati
Kaunteya pratijānīhi na me bhaktaḥ praṇaśyati

31. Soon he becomes a righteous person, and attains to eternal peace; do you, O son of Kuntī, proclaim that My devotee never perishes.

Soon, he becomes a righteous person, has his mind solely devoted to virtue (dharma), *and attains to eternal peace*, perpetual calmness. Listen to this supreme truth, *O son of Kuntī*, and *proclaim*, declare, resolutely this, namely, *that My devotee*, he who has dedicated his inner soul (antarātmā) to Me, *never perishes.*

Also.

मां हि पार्थ व्यपाश्रित्य येऽपि स्युः पापयोनयः ।
स्त्रियो वैश्यास्तथा शूद्रास्तेऽपि यान्ति परां गतिम् ॥३२॥

Mām hi Pārtha vyapāśritya ye(a)pi syuḥ pāpa-yonayaḥ

Striyo vaiśyās-tathā śūdras-te(a)pi yānti parām gatim

32. Indeed, taking refuge in Me, they also, O Pārtha, who might be of low birth—women, Vaiśyas, as well as Sūdras,—even they attain to the supreme Goal.

Indeed, taking refuge in Me, they also, O Pārtha ,who might be of low birth, those who, on account of sins, are born in an inferior condition:—who they are is told: women, Vaiśyas, as well as Śūdras,—even they attain to the supreme, most excellent Goal.[25]

किं पुनर्ब्राह्मणाः पुण्या भक्ता राजर्षयस्तथा ।
अनित्यमसुखं लोकमिमं प्राप्य भजस्व माम् ॥ ३३ ॥

Kim punar-Brāhmaṇāḥ puṇyā bhaktā rājarṣayas-tathā

Anityam-asukham lokam-imam prāpya bhajasva mām

33. How much more then the holy Brāhmaṇas and devoted Rājarṣis! Having reached this transient joyless world, do you worship Me.

How much more then the holy Brāhmaṇas, of pure birth *and devoted Rājarṣis,* kings who attain to Ṛṣihood (sainthood)! Because it is thus, therefore, *having reached this transient,* perishable every moment, *joyless,* unhappy, *world* of mortals, that is to say, having obtained human birth[26] which is the means of attaining the supreme end of life (puruṣārtha) and which is hard to get, *do you worship Me,* devote youself to Me.

25. The Lord declares that, in the matter of qualification for devotion, there is no restriction by way of birth. (Ā)

26. Because a body other than a man's, such as a beast's, is not fit for the practice of devotion to the Lord, one should apply himself to devotion to the Lord when he has obtained a human body. (Ā)

In what manner?

मन्मना भव मद्भक्तो मद्याजी मां नमस्कुरु ।
मामेवैष्यसि युक्त्वैवमात्मानं मत्परायणः ॥ ३४ ॥

Man-mamā bhava mad-bhakto· mad-yāji mām namaskuru

Mām-evaiṣyasi yuktvaivam ātmānam mat-parāyaṇaḥ

34. Fix your mind on Me, be My devotee, sacrifice unto Me, bow down to Me; thus steadfast, with Me as the supreme Goal, you shall reach Me, the Self.

Fix your mind on Me, become a person who has his mind on Me, Vāsudeva; so also, *be My devotee*; *sacrifice unto Me*, always be inclined to sacrifice to Me; *and bow down to Me* alone; *thus steadfast*, fixing your mind (in Me alone), *with Me as the supreme Goal, you shall reach Me*, the Lord (Īśvara), *the Self*: I am the Self of all beings and the supreme Goal.

इति श्रीमहाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्यां
भीष्मपर्वणि श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु
ब्रह्मविद्यायां योगशास्त्रे श्रीकृष्णार्जुन-
संवादे राजविद्या - राजगुह्ययोगो
नाम नवमोऽध्यायः ॥

Iti Śrī Mahābhārate śata-sāhasryām samhitāyām Vaiyāsikyām Bhīṣma-Parvaṇi Śrimad-Bhagavad-Gītāsūpaniṣatsu Brahma-vidyāyām yoga-śastre Śrī Kṛṣṇārjuna samvāde Raja-vidya-rāja-guhya-yogo nāma navamo(a)dhyāyah.

Thus the ninth chapter entitled 'Yoga of Kingly Knowledge and Kingly Secret' in the Upanisads known as 'The Celebrated Songs of the Lord' expounding the knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between Sri Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna—embodied in the Bhīṣma-Parva of Śrī Mahābhārata, the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyāsa.

दशमोऽध्यायः
(विभूति योगः)

DAŚAMO(A)DHYĀYAḤ

VIBHŪTI YOGAḤ

CHAPTER - X

(MODE[1] OF DIVINE GLORY)

In the seventh chapter, as also in the ninth, the essential nature (*tattva*) of the Lord and His glories have been elucidated Now, then, it is necessary to set out (in further detail) whatever are the objects in which the Lord is capable of being (easily) thought of; (i.e. the objects in which the Lord's glory appear to be pronouncedly manifest;) it is also necessary to describe (again) the essential nature of the Lord, although it has been mentioned already, because it is difficult to understand (without celaborate description). With this view, therefore,

श्री भगवानुवाच—

भूय एव महाबाहो शृणु मे परमं वचः ।
यत्तेऽहं प्रीयमाणाय वक्ष्यामि हितकाम्यया ॥ १ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Bhūya eva mahā-bāho śṛṇu me paramam vacaḥ
Yatte(a)ham prīyamāṇāya vakṣyāmi hita-kāmyayā

The Blessed Lord said—

1. Again, O mighty-armed, do you listen to My supreme word, which, I, wishing your welfare, will tell you who are delighted (to hear Me).

1. 'Yoga' in the original—for different interpretation of 'yoga' in this context see Com. on verse 7 and footnotes thereto.

Again, once more, *O mighty-armed, do you listen to My supreme word*, most excellent, because it discloses the unsurpassed Reality, *which supreme word, I wishing your welfare*, out of the desire for your well-being, *will tell you, who are delighted* (*to hear Me*), who feel extremely pleased with My discourse, as if drinking the nectar of immortality (amṛta).

Why am I telling this to you? The Lord gives the reason[2]:

न मे विदुः सुरगणाः प्रभवं न महर्षयः ।
अहमादिर्हि देवानां महर्षीणां च सर्वशः ॥ २ ॥

Na me viduḥ sura-gaṇāḥ prabhavam na maharṣayaḥ
Aham-ādir-hi devānām maharṣīṇām ca sarvaśaḥ

2. Neither the hosts of Devas, nor the great Ṛṣis, know My origin; for, I am, in all respects, the source of the Devas and the great Ṛṣis.

Neither the hosts of Devas, Indra and the rest[3], *nor also the great Ṛṣis*, Bhṛgu and others, *know My origin* ("prabhava")—or to give another interpretation, My great Lordly Power ("prabhāva"). Why do they not know it? The Lord gives the reason: *for, I am, in all respects*, in every way[4], *the source*, the cause, *of* all *the Devas and the great Ṛṣis*.

Moreover[5].

यो मामजमनादिं च वेत्ति लोकमहेश्वरम् ।
असंमूढः स मर्त्येषु सर्वपापैः प्रमुच्यते ॥ ३ ॥

2. namely, that nobody else can impart such supreme instruction. (Ā)

3. *Indrādayah acc.* to Ānandagiri. A different reading is *Brahmādayah*, "Brahma and the rest".

4. The Lord is their producer, being both the material (*upādāna*) and the efficient (*nimitta*) cause. They, being His effects, cannot therefore know Him. (Ā)

5. That person, who might know of the Lord's greateness is a rarity. (Ā)

Yo mām-ajam-anādim ca vetti loka-maheśvaram
Asammūdhaḥ sa martyeṣu sarva-pāpaiḥ
pramucyate

3. He, who knows Me, birthless and beginningless, the great Lord of the worlds,—he, among mortals, is undeluded,he is freed from all sins.

He, who knows Me, birthless and beginningless: because I am the source of all the Devas and the great Ṛṣis, none other exists as My source; therefore I am birthless and beginningless; (My) beginning-less-ness is the proof for (My) birth-less-ness. He who knows Me to be birthless and beginningless, *the great Lord of the worlds*, the Fourth (Turiyam)[6], beyond nescience and its effects, he, among *mortals*, men, *is undeluded*, is rid of ignorance; *he is freed*, liberated, *from all sins*, consciously and unconsciously incurred

For the following reason also, I am the great Lord of the world

बुद्धिर्ज्ञानमसंमोहः क्षमा सत्यं दमः शमः ।
सुखं दुःखं भवोऽभावो भयं चाभयमेव च ॥ ४ ॥

Buddhir-jñānam-asammohaḥ kṣamā satyam
damaḥ śamaḥ
Sukham duḥkham bhavo(a)bhāvo bhayam
cābhayam eva ca

4. Intellect, knowledge, non-delusion, forbearance, truth, self-restraint, calmness, happiness, misery, birth, death, fear, as well as fearlessness;

(the sentence is completed in the next verse.)

Intellect, the power of the inner-sense (antaḥ-karaṇa) which understands the subtle and other[7] objects (of thought): only that

6. transcending the three, *Visva*, *Taijasa* and *Prajna*, whose spheres are respectively the states of waking, dream, and dream-less sleep, which make up the world of experience. (Ma.7).

7. 'otheı' refers to the subtler and subtltest objects (of thought). (A)

person who has this power is truly said to be intelligent; *knowledge*, the perception (awareness) of the Self and other things[8]; *non-delusion*, that kind of behaviour which is attended with discernment when confronted with objects to be understood[9]; *forebearance*, not being perturbed in mind when abused or beaten; *truth*, speech which gives utterance to one's own experience, exactly as it was seen or heard, with a view to transferring it to another's mind; *self-restraint*, stopping the external senses (from their objects); *calmness*, stopping the mind (antaḥ-karaṇa) (from its objects); *happiness*, joy; *misery*, agony; *birth*, production *death*, the opposite of birth; *fear*, terror; *as well as fearlessness*, the opposite of fear;

अहिंसा समता तुष्टिस्तपो दानं यशोऽयशः।
भवन्ति भावा भूतानां मत्त एव पृथग्विधाः ॥ ५ ॥

Ahimsā samatā tuṣṭis-tapo dānam yaśo(a)yaśaḥ
Bhavanti bhāvā bhūtānām matta eva pṛthag-vidhāḥ

5. Non-injury, even-ness, contentment, austerity, benevolence, good name, ill-fame;—(these) different kinds of dispositions of beings arise from Me alone,

Non-injury, not causing pain to living beings, *even-ness*, equanimity of mind; *contentment*, satisfaction, the feeling of having had enough with what has been obtained; *austerity*, subjection of the body to pain, accompanied with control of the senses; *benevolence*, sharing (of one's wealth) to the extent of his capacity; *good name*, fame due to virtue (dharma); *ill-fame*, bad name due to vice (adharma);—(*these*) *different kinds of dispositions* in the manifold form,s intellect and others afore-mentioned (verses 4 and 5), of living beings *arise from Me*, Īśvara, *alone*, according to their respective karma.

8. Only he who has this knowledge is truly said to be a *jñānin* (man of wisdom). (Ā)

9. i.e. absence of confusion; true insight.

Moreover,

महर्षयः सप्त पूर्वे चत्वारो मनवस्तथा ।
मद्भावा मानसा जाता येषां लोक इमाः प्रजाः ॥ ६ ॥

Maharṣayaḥ sapta pūrve catvāro manavas-tathā
Mad-bhāvā mānasā jātā yeṣām loka imāḥ prajāḥ

6. The seven great Ṛṣis, as well as the four ancient Manus, with their being in Me, were born of (My) mind; from whom are these creatures in the world.

The seven great Ṛṣis, such as Bhṛgu[10], *as well as the four ancient Manus*, belonging to past ages and well-known as the Sāvarṇas[11];—all of them had *their being in Me*, had fixed their thoughts on Me, and were, (consequently) possessed of power like Viṣṇu (Myself) and *were born of My mind*, were produced by Me, by mind alone; *from whom are these creatures in the world*: the creatures in the world moving and stationary, are the creation of these Manus and the great Ṛṣis.

एतां विभूतिं योगं च मम यो वेत्ति तत्त्वतः ।
सोऽविकम्पेन योगेन युज्यते नात्र संशयः ॥ ७ ॥

Etām vibhūtim yogam ca mama yo vetti tattvataḥ
So(a)vikampena yogena yujyate nātra saṁśayaḥ

7. He who in reality knows this glory and *yoga* of Mine, becomes established in the unshakable *yoga*; there is no doubt of it.

10. The foremost of them (vide X-25). The others are Marīci, Atri, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu and Vasiṣṭha.

11. In each *kalpa*, fourteen Manus appear and hold office in succession. The four Manus, well-known as Sāvarṇas, are Sāvarṇi, Dharma-Sāvarṇi, Dakṣa-Sāvarṇi and Sāvarṇa.

He who, in reality, truly (correctly), *knows this* aforesaid-*glory*, magnificence[12], *and yoga*, skill accomplishment of the Self (Myself)[13];—or, 'yoga' refers to the capacity of achieving and controlling (all things) and omniscience, produced by yoga[14]—*of Mine*, he *becomes established in*, gets endowed with, *the unshakable yoga*, steadiness in true knowledge (samyag- darśana)[15]. *There is no doubt of it*, i.e., on this matter.

Of what nature is that unshakable *yoga*, with which they are endowed? Here is the reply:

अहं सर्वस्य प्रभवो मत्तः सर्वं प्रवर्तते ।
इति मत्वा भजन्ते मां बुधा भावसमन्विताः ॥ ८ ॥

Aham sarvasya prabhavo mattaḥ sarvam pravartate
Iti matvā bhajante mām budhā bhāva-samanvitāḥ

8. I am the origin of all; from Me everything evolves;—thus thinking, the Wise worship Me, with loving consciousness.

I, the Supreme Brahman, named Vāsudeva, *am the origin*, source, *of all* the universe; *from Me* alone, *everything*, the whole universe constituting the modifications such as existence and destruction, action, effect and enjoyment, *evolves*:—*thus thinking, the Wise*, those who have comprehended the Supreme Reality[16], *worship Me, with loving consciousness*, endowed with devotion to the Supreme Truth.

Moreover,

12. greatness, i.e. being the Self of all. (Ā)

13. vide verses 4 and 5 ante.

14. The Lord's infinite power and wisdom, partaking of a small portion of which the great Ṛṣis and the Manus possessed their power and wisdom. (Ā)

15. The knowledge of the Conditioned leads to the knowledge of the Unconditioned. (Ā)

16. This shows that only they who understand the worthlessness of worldly life (*saṁsāra*) are competent for devotion to the Lord. (Ā)

मच्चित्ता मद्गतः प्राणा बोधयन्तः परस्परम् ।
कथयन्तश्च मां नित्यं तुष्यन्ति च रमन्ति च ॥ ९ ॥

Maccittā mad-gataḥ prāṇā bodhayantaḥ parasparam
Kathayantaśca mām nityam tuṣyanti ca ramanti ca

9. With minds wholly in Me, with lives absorbed in Me, mutually enlightening, and always speaking of Me, they are satisfied and delighted.

With minds wholly in Me, with lives absorbed in Me: their lives, i.e. senses,—the eye and the rest—become absorbed in Me; or to give another interpretation, their lives (prāṇas) i.e. their very existence (jivana) is dedicated to Me; *mutually enlightening*, instructing each other, *and always speaking of Me,* ever conversing about Me possessed of the attributes of wisdom, strength and valour etc., *they are satisfied*, they obtain contentment, *and delighted*, they derive joy as if in the company of the beloved.

For those, who being My devotees, worship Me in the ways mentioned above,—

तेषां सततयुक्तानां भजतां प्रितिपूर्वकम् ।
ददामि बुद्धियोगं तं येन मामुपयान्ति ते ॥ १० ॥

Teṣām satata-yuktānām bhajatām prīti-pūrvakam
Dadāmi buddhi-yogam tam yena mām-upayānti te

10. To them, ever steadfast and worshipping Me with (out of) affection, I give that *Buddhi-yoga*, by which they come unto Me.

To them, ever steadfast, perpetually devoted (to Me), having freed themselves from all other external desires, *and worshipping Me, serving* Me;—is it for obtaining any desired object of their

own? No, says the Lord: it is purely *out of affection* for Me that they worship Me. To them, *I give that Buddhi-yoga*[17], the devotion to Right (Plenary) Knowledge concerning My true Being, *by which they come unto Me*, by which Right Knowledge they know Me, the Supreme Lord (Paramesvara) who is the very Self, as their own Self.

Who are they? Those who worship Me in the manner stated, 'with their minds wholly in Me' etc. (X.9)[18].

Why, and for destroying what obstacle to reaching Thee, dost Thou give the devotion of Knowledge (*Buddhi-yoga*) to those devotees of Thine? As to this, the Lord says:

तेषामेवानुकम्पार्थमहमज्ञानजं तमः ।
नाशयाम्यात्मभावस्थो ज्ञानदीपेन भास्वता ॥ ११ ॥

Teṣām-evānukaṁpārtham aham-ajñānajam tamaḥ
Nāśayāmyātma-bhāvastho jñāna-dīpena bhāsvatā

11 Out of mere compassion for them, I, abiding in their self, destroy the darkness (in them) born of ignorance, by the luminous lamp of Knowledge.

Out of mere compassion for them, through pity as to how else indeed can supreme felicity (bliss) accrue to them, *I, abiding in their self*, dwelling in that particular mode of the antaḥ-karaṇa inner-sense) which is of the form of the Self[19]., *destroy the darkness*

17. The exalted state of the *antaḥ-karaṇa* produced by *Dhyāna*, which is the means to the attainment of that form of the Lord which is devoid of all attributes. (Ā)

18. The question and the answer indicate the class of persons who are qualified for *Buddhi-yoga*. They are those who are devoted to the Lord in the manner stated in verse 9. (Ā)

19. Pure Spirit (*Caitanya*) cannot directly destroy nescience (*ajñāna*) and its product, illusory knowledge (*mithyā-jñāna*). Only an intellectual state (*buddhi-vrtti*) can accomplish it. Therefore, it is said that the Spirit (*Cidātma*) destroys ignorance by shining through a state of the intellect, such as is produced by the teaching (of scriptural texts or the Guru). It is either the Wisdom (*Bodha*) manifesting itself through an intellectual state, or an intellectual state pervaded by Wisdom, that can destroy nescience and illusory knowledge. (Ā)

of delusion ("moha"), the illusory understanding (false conception) *born of ignorance*, caused by the absence of discrimination, *by the luminous lamp of Knowledge*,—

The lamp of discriminatory wisdom, fed by the oil of composure favoured by Bhakti (devotion), fanned by the wind of absorbing meditation in Me, furnished with the wick of pure Consciousness evolved by the constant cultivation of Brahmacarya and other pious virtues, held in the reservoir of the heart that is devoid of worldliness, placed in the wind-sheltered reces of the mind that is withdrawn from sense-objects and is untainted by attachment and aversion, and shining with the light of Right (Plenary) Knowledge, engendered by incessant practice of concentration and meditation—this is the lamp which is luminous with the light of Right Knowledge.

Having heard the Lord's glory and *yoga*, as stated above,

अर्जुन उवाच—

परं ब्रह्म परं धाम पवित्रं परमं भवान् ।
पुरुषं शाश्वतं दिव्यमादिदेवमजं विभुम् ॥ १२ ॥

Arjuna uvāca—

Param Brahma param dhāma pavitram paramam bhavān
Puruṣam śāśvatam divyam ādidevam ajam vibhum

12. The Supreme Brahman, the Supreme Light, the Supreme Purifier, art Thou; Eternal, Divine Puruṣa, the first Deva, Birthless and All-pervading;

(The sentence is completed in the next verse)

The Supreme Brahman, the Highest Self (Paramatma), *the Supreme Light*, the most excellent Splendour, *the Supreme Purifier, art Thou*; *Eternal*, Ever-lasting, *Divine*, *Supernatural. Purusa, the first Deva*, the God who has been existent before all other gods, *Birthless, and All-pervading*, extending everywhere.

So,

आहुस्त्वामृषयः सर्वे देवर्षिर्नारदस्तथा ।
असितो देवलो व्यासः स्वयं चैव ब्रवीषि मे ॥ १३ ॥

Āhus-tvam-ṛṣayaḥ sarve devarṣir-Nāradas-tathā
Asito Devalo Vyāsah svayam caiva bravīṣi me

13. (Thus have) declared all the Ṛṣis, the Deva-ṛṣi Nārada, as also Asita, Devala and Vyāsa; and Thou Thyself also sayest (so) to me.

(*Thus have*) *declared all the Ṛṣis,* such as Vasiṣṭha, *the Devarṣi*[20] *Nārada, as also Asita* and *Devala*[21] have said so; *and Vyasa* also; *and Thou Thyself also sayest* (*so*) *to me.*

सर्वमेतदृतं मन्ये यन्मां वदसि केशव ।
न हि ते भगवन्व्यक्तिं विदुर्देवा न दानवाः ॥ १४ ॥

Sarvam-etad-ṛtam manye yan-mām vadasi Keśava
Na hi te Bhagavan-vyaktim vidur-devā na dānavāḥ

14. I regard as true all this which Thou sayest to me, O Keśava. Verily, O Bhagavān, neither the Devas nor the Dānavas know Thy real form.

I regard as true all this, as declared by Ṛṣis and Thyself, *which Thou sayest to me, O Keśava. Verily, O Bhagavān,*[22] *neither the Devas nor the Dānavas*[23] *know Thy real form*[24].

20. *Devarṣis* can exercise control even over the celestials. The following are some of them: Nara and Nārāyaṇa, the Vālakhilyas, Kardama, Parvata, Nārada, Asita and Vatsara (sons of Kaśyapa). (*Vāyu-Purāṇa*: IX, 83-85). See also X.26 Com.

21. Devala, son of Asita, was well-versed in the Vedas, a teacher of Yoga and a great ascetic. Both Asita and Devala are seers of the *Ṛg Veda* (*Kūrma Purāṇa*. XIX.5).

22. See III. 37 Com.

23. demons, the issues of Danu, a daughter of Daksa, married to Kaśyapa.

24. The Lord's essential nature, devoid of attributes (*nirupādika-svabhāva*). (Ā)

Since Thou art the origin of the Devas and the others, therefore,

स्वयमेवात्मनाऽऽत्मानं वेत्थ त्वं पुरुषोत्तम ।
भूतभावन भूतेश देवदेव जगत्पते ॥ १५ ॥

Svayam-evātmanā(ā)tmānam vettha tvam Puruṣottama
Bhūta-bhāvana bhūteśa devadeva jagatpate

15. Verily, Thou Thyself knowest by Thyself the Self (or Thyself), O Puruṣottama, O Source of beings, O Lord of beings, O God of the gods, O Ruler of the universe!

Verily, Thou Thyself knowest by Thyself the Self (*or Thyself*)[25], the Lord (Īśvara) possessing unsurpassed knowledge, sovereignty, strength and other powers. *O Puruṣottama, O Source of beings* Thou who manifest beings, *O Lord of beings, O God of the gods, O Ruler of the universe*!

वक्तुमर्हस्यशेषेण दिव्या ह्यात्मविभूतयः ।
याभिर्विभूतिभिर्लोकानिमांस्त्वं व्याप्य तिष्ठसि ॥ १६ ॥

Vaktum-arhasyaśeṣeṇa divyā hyātma-vibhūtayaḥ
Yābhir-vibhūtibhir-lokān-imāms-tvam vyāypya tiṣṭhasi

16. Thou shouldst indeed speak, without reserve, of Thy divine glories, by which Thou standest pervading all these worlds.

25. *Thou Thyself*, i.e. without (another's) teaching, *knowest by Thyself*, inwardly, not as an object external (to Thyself), *the Self*, Thy unconditioned nature. Even the conditioned nature of the Lord—that is possessed of unsurpassed knowledge etc. (described in the commentary)—stands beyond the ken of others. (Ā)

Thou shouldst indeed speak,[26] tell, *without reserve, of Thy divine glories, by which* amplitude of Thy greatness, *Thou standest pervading all these worlds.*

कथं विद्यामहं योगिंस्त्वां सदा परिचिन्तयन् ।
केषु केषु च भावेषु चिन्त्योऽसि भगवन्मया ॥ १७ ॥

Katham vidyāmaham yogims-tvām sadā paricinatayan
Keṣu keṣu ca bhāveṣu cintyo(a)si Bhagavan-mayā

17 How shall I, O Yogin, ever meditating, know Thee? In what several things, O Bhagavān, art Thou to be thought of by me?

How shall I, O Yogin, ever meditating, know, comprehend, *Thee*[27]? *In what several things*, objects, *O Bhagavān, art Thou to be thought of*, contemplated upon, *by me*?

विस्तरेणात्मनो योगं विभूतिं च जनार्दन ।
भूयः कथय तृप्तिर्हि शृण्वतो नास्ति मेऽमृतम् ॥ १८ ॥

Vistareṇātmano yogam vibhūtim ca Janārdana
Bhūyaḥ kathaya tṛptir-hi sṛṇvato nāsti me(a)mṛtam

18. Speak to me again, in detail, O Janārdana, of Thy *yoga* and glory; for, there is no satiety for me in hearing the nectar (of Thy speech).

Speak to me, again, though stated previously, *in detail, of Thy yoga*, Thy mysterious sovereign power, *and glory*, the detailed particulars about the objects of contemplation, *O Janārdana,—*

26. Because, Thy nature, which it is necessary to know, is beyond the ken of others, like myself. (Ā)

27. In what manner am I of the most stolid intellect to meditate constantly on Thee, whereby, getting my intellect purified, I shall be able to comprehend Thee, the Un-conditioned. (Ā)

the Lord is so called because he causes Asuras, the people ("jana") who are inimical to the gods, to go to hell and similar places (—from the root "ard", signifying "moving"); or because he is prayed to (" ard " also means begging) by all people ("jana") for the grant of the ends of life, namely prosperity and liberation. *For, there is no satiety*, contentment, *for me, in hearing the nectar*, the speech (which is like nectar) that flows from Thy mouth.

श्री भगवानुवाच —

हन्त ते कथयिष्यामि दिव्या ह्यात्मविभूतयः ।
प्राधान्यतः कुरुश्रेष्ठ नास्त्यन्तो विस्तरस्य मे ॥ १९ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Hanta te kathayiṣyāmi divyā hyātma-vibhūtayaḥ
Prādhānyataḥ Kuru-śreṣṭha nāstyanto vistarasya me

The Blessed Lord said—

19. Well, I shall speak to you now, O best of Kurus, of My divine glories according to their prominence; there is no end to the amplitude (of My glories).

Well, I shall speak to you now, O best of Kurus, of My divine, heavenly *glories, according to their prominence,* i.e. only those which are severally the most prominent of their class. It is not possible to describe them completely even in a hundred years, for, *there is no end to the amplitude of My glories.*

Now, firstly, hear this:

अहमात्मा गुडाकेश सर्वभूताशयस्थितः ।
अहमादिश्च मध्यं च भूतानामन्त एव च ॥ २० ॥

Aham-ātmā guḍākeśa sarva-bhūtāśaya-sthitaḥ
Aham-ādiśca madhyam ca bhūtānam-anta eva ca

20. I am the Self, O Guḍākeśa, existent in the heart of all beings; and I am the beginning, and the middle, and also the end of all beings.

O Guḍākeśa, he who has conquered sleep or he who has dense hair, *I am the Self*, the inner-most Self ("Pratyagātman"), *existent in the heart of all beings*, seated in the heart within all beings. I am to be always thought of as the Self, he "Pratyagātman"[28]. But he who is not capable of thinking of Me as the Self should think of Me in the objects mentioned hereafter. I can be contem plated (in them), for, *I am the beginning*, the source (birth), *and the middle*, the stay (life), *and also the end*, dissolution (death), *of all beings*.

I am to be thought of thus:

आदित्यानामहं विष्णुर्ज्योतिषां रविरंशुमान् ।
मरीचिर्मरुतामस्मि नक्षत्राणामहं शशी ॥ २१ ॥

Adityānām-aham Viṣṇur-jyotiṣām ravir-amśumān
Marīcir-marutām-asmi nakṣatrāṇām-aham śaśī

21. Of the Adityas, I am Viṣṇu; of luminaries, the radiant Sun; of the Maruts, I am Marici; of the asterisms, I am Śaśī.

Of the twelve *Adityas*[29], *I am* the Aditya known by the name of *Viṣṇu*; *of luminaries* that illuminate, *I am the radiant Sun*, possessing rays of light; *of the Maruts*[30], the class of Devatās (gods) known by that name, *I am* the one named *Marīci*; *of the asterisms, I am Śaśī*, the moon.

वेदानां सामवेदोऽस्मि देवानामस्मि वासवः ।
इन्द्रियाणां मनश्चास्मि भूतानामस्मि चेतना ॥२२॥

28. This is the essential form of the Lord (*Pāramārtikam Parameśvaram Rūpam*). (Ā)

29. The Ādityas, sons of Kaśyapa and Additi, are: Dhātā, Mitra, Aryamā, Indra, Varuṇa, Aṃśa, Bhaga, Vivasvān, Pūṣa, Savitā, Tvaṣṭā, and Viṣṇu (*M.B.Adi.*LXV. 15, 16.)

30. The Maruts, forty nine in number, were born of Diti and Kaśyapa. They became the wind-gods and friends of Indra. (*V.P.*I.xxi. -30—41)

Vedānām sāmavedo(a)smi devānām-asmi Vāsavaḥ
Indriyāṇām mamaścāsmi bhūtānām-asmi cetanā

22. Of the Vedas, I am the Sāma-Veda; of the gods, I am Vāsava; and of the senses, I am Manas; in living beings, I am intelligence.

Of, among, *the Vedas, I am the Sama-Veda*; *of the gods*, Rudras, Ādityas and the others[31], *I am Vāsava*, Indra; *and of the senses*, eye and the rest, eleven in number[32], *I am Manas*, the mind, characterised by volition and indecision; *in living beings, I am intelligence*, that state of the intellect (buddhi) which uninterruptedly manifests itself in the aggregate of the body and the senses[33].

रुद्राणां शङ्करश्चास्मि वित्तेशो यक्षरक्षसाम् ।
वसूनां पावकश्चास्मि मेरुः शिखरिणामहम् ॥ २३ ॥

Rudrāṇām Śaṅkaraścāsmi vitteśo yakṣa-rakṣasām
Vasūnam pāvakaścāsmi Meruḥ śikhariṇām-aham

23. And of the Rudras, I am Śaṅkara; of the Yakṣas and Rākṣasas, the Lord of wealth; and of the Vasus, I am Pāvaka; of the mountains, I am Meru.

And of the eleven *Rudras*[34], *I am Śaṅkara*; *of the Yaksas and Rākṣasas, the Lord of wealth*, Kubera; *and of the* eight *Vasus*[35],

31. The gods are thirty-three: the eight Vasus, the eleven Rudıas, the twelve Ādityas, Indra and Prajāpati. (Br.III.ix.-2).

32. The eleven senses are: the five *jñānendriyas* (those of hearing, touch, sight, taste and smell), the five *karmendriyas* (hands, feet, mouth, the organ of generation, and the anus), and mind.

33. The aggregate of the body and the senses is presided over by the *jīva*; and *cetama* (intelligence) prevades this aggregate everywhere till death and forms the medium for the manifestation of *Caitanya* (the Spirit of Consciousness) (Ā). See also XIII.6.Com.

34. The eleven Rudras are: Hara, Bahurūpa, Tryambaka, Aparājita, Vṛṣākapi, Śambhu, Kapardī, Raivata, Mṛgavyādha, Śarva, and Kapāli. *Harivaṁśa* I.iii. 51, 52). Of these, Śambhu is the one referred to as Śaṇkara.

35. The eight Vasus are: Dhruva, Dhara, Soma, Aha, anila, Anala, Pratyūṣa, and Prabhāsa. (*M.B.-Adi.*LXVI.18). Anala is Agni.

I am Pāvaka, Agni; *of the mountains*, those that have peaks, *I am Meru.*

पुरोधसां च मुख्यं मां विद्धि पार्थ बृहस्पतिम् ।
सेनानीमहं स्कन्दः सरसामस्मि सागरः ॥ २४ ॥

Purodhasām ca mukhyam mām viddhi Pārtha Bṛhaspatim

Senānīnām-aham Skandaḥ sarasām-asmi sāgaraḥ

24. And of the priests, O Pārtha, know Me to be the chief one, Bṛhaspati; of generals, I am Skanda; of bodies of water, I am the ocean.

And of the priests of Kings, *O Pārtha, know Me to be the chief one, Bṛhaspati*: he is verily the chief priest, because he is the household priest of Indra; *of generals*, commanders of armies, *I am Skanda*, the general of the gods; *of bodies of water*, the natural reservoirs of water, *I am the ocean.*

महर्षीणां भृगुरहं गिरामस्म्येकमक्षरम् ।
यज्ञानां जपयज्ञोऽस्मि स्थावराणां हिमालयः ॥ २५ ॥

Maharṣīṇām Bhṛgur-aham girām asmyekam-akṣaram

Yajñānām japa-yajño(a)smi sthāvarāṇām Himālayaḥ

25. Of the great Ṛṣis, I am Bhṛgu; of words, I am the one-syllable; of yajñas, I am the yajña of Japa; of immovable things, the Himālaya.

Of the great Ṛṣis[36], *I am Bhrgu*; *of words*, sound in the form of words, *I am the one-syllable, Omkara*[37]; *of yajñas*, sacrifices, *I am*

36. See X.6. and note 10.

37. It is the most important word, being the symbol and the designation of Brahman. (Ā)

the yajña of Japa[38]; *of immovable things,* those that remain stationary, *the Himālaya.*

अश्वत्थः सर्ववृक्षाणां देवर्षीणां च नारदः ।
गन्धर्वाणां चित्ररथः सिद्धानां कपिलो मुनिः । २६ ॥

Aśvatthaḥ sarva-vṛkṣāṇām devarṣīṇām ca Nāradaḥ
Gandharvāṇām Citrarathaḥ siddhānām Kapilo munih

26. Of all trees, (I am) the Aśvattha; and Nārada, among Devarṣis; Citraratha among Gandharvas; and the Muni Kapila among the Siddhas.

Of all trees, (*I am*) *the Asvattha*[39]; *and Nārada among Devarṣis*[40], those who are Devas (gods) and at the same time have attained Ṛṣi-hood being seers of mantras, of them, I am Nārada; I am the one named *Citraratha*[41], *among Gandharvas*; *and the Muni Kapila*[42] *among the Siddhas,* those who in their very birth have attained excellence of Dharma, of wisdom, of dispassion (vairāgya), and of supremacy.

उच्चैःश्रवसमश्वानां विद्धि माममृतोद्भवम् ।
ऐरावतं गजेन्द्राणां नराणां च नराधिपम् ॥ २७ ॥

Uccaihśravasam-aśvānām vidhi mām-amṛtodbhavam
Airāvatam gajendrāṇām narāṇām ca narādhipam

38. Because there is no injury or loss of life involved in it, Japa is the foremos among sacrifices. (Ā)

39. *Ficus religiosa.*

40. See also X-13 and note 20.

41. One of the sixteen Gandharva sons of Kaśyapa and Muni, a daughter of Dakṣa-Prajāpati.

42. An incarnation of Lord Viṣṇu; and Lord of Siddhas. (*Bhāgavata*-III. xxiv.19). For the meaning of Muni, See X.37.Com).

27. Know Me among horses as Uccaiśrava, born of Amṛta; among lordly elephants as Airāvata; and among men, the king,

Know Me among horses as the (best) horse named *Uccaiśrava, born of Amṛta,* i.e. brought forth when the ocean was churned for the sake of Amṛta (nectar); *among lordly elephants,* elephant-chiefs, know Me *as Airāvata,* the off-spring of Irāvat[43]; *and among men,* know Me to be *the king,* the ruler.

आयुधानामहं वज्रं धेनूनामस्मि कामधुक् ।
प्रजनश्चास्मि कन्दर्पः सर्पाणामस्मि वासुकिः ॥ २८ ॥

Ayudhānām-aham vajram dhenūnām-asmi kāmadhuk
Prajanaścāsmi Kandarpḥ sarpāṇām-asmi Vāsukiḥ

28. Of weapons, I am the thunder-bolt; of cows, I am Kāmadhuk; I am Kandarpa, the progenitor; of serpents, I am Vāsuki.

Of weapons, I am the thunderbolt, the Vajra (weapon of Indra) fashioned out of the bone of Dadhīci[44]; *of cows,* the animals yielding milk, *I am Kāmadhuk,* Kamadhenu, the cow of Vasiṣṭha which could yield all objects desired; or any cow in general yielding plenty of milk; *I am Kandarpa,* Kāma, the god of love, *the-progenitor,* the cause of off-spring; of *serpents* i.e. among the serpents of various classes, *I am Vāsuki,* the king of serpents.

अनन्तश्चास्मि नागानां वरुणो यादसामहम् ।
पितृणामर्यमा चास्मि यमः संयमतामहम् ॥ २९ ॥

Anantaścāsmi nāgānām Varuṇo yādasām-aham
Pitṛṇām-Aryamā cāsmi Yamaḥ saṁyamatām-aham

43. Irāvat is the ocean; like Uccaisrava, Airāvata was also brought forth when the ocean was churned.

44. See *Bha avata.* VI.xi.19, 20.

29. And Ananta among snakes am I; I am Varuṇa among water-beings; and among the *Pitṛs* I am Aryamā; I am Yama among the controllers.

And Ananta, the king of snakes, *among* the different species of *snakes am I*; *I am Varuṇa*, the king of the water-deities, *among water-being*; *and among the Pitṛs, I am* the one named *Aryamā*, the king of Pitṛs[45]; *I am Yama among the controllers*, those that rule, govern.

प्रह्लादश्चास्मि दैत्यानां कालः कलयतामहम् ।
मृगाणां च मृगेन्द्रोऽहं वैनतेयश्च पक्षिणाम् ॥ ३० ॥

Prahlādaścāsmi daityānāmkālaḥ kalayatām-aham
Mṛgāṇām ca mṛgendro(a)ham Vainateyaśca pakisṇām

30. And Prahlāda and I among Daityas; of reckoners, I am Time; and of beasts, I am the lord of beasts; and Vainateya among birds.

And among Daityas, the progeny of Ditti, *I am* he named *Prahlāda*; *of reckoners*, those engaged in counting, calculation, *I am Time*; *and of beasts, I am the lord of beasts*, the lion, or the tiger; *and Vainateya* Garutmān[46], the son of Vinata, *among birds*, those that fly.

पवनः पवतामस्मि रामः शस्त्रभृतामहम् ।
झषाणां मकरश्चास्मि स्रोतसामस्मि जाह्नवी ॥ ३१ ॥

Pavanaḥ pavatām-asmi Ramaḥ śastra-bhṛtām-aham
Jhaṣāṇām makaraścāsmi srotasām-asmi Jāhnavī

45. The seven Pitṛs (manes) are: Kavyavāha, Anala, Soma, Yama, Aryamā, the Agniṣvāttas, and the Barhiṣads.

46. Garyḍa, Viṣṇu's vehicle.

31. I am the Wind, among the purifiers; Rāma, among warriors am I; of fish, I am the shark; of streams, I am Jāhnavī.

I am the Wind, Vāyu, *among the purifiers*; *Rāma*, the son of Daśaratha, *among warriors*, those who bear weapons, *am I*; *of fish*; etc., *I am* that species known as *the shark*; *of streams*, rivers with flowing water, *I am Jāhnavi*, the Gaṅgā.

सर्गाणामादिरन्तश्च मध्यं चैवाहमर्जुन ।
अध्यात्मविद्या विद्यानां वादः प्रवदतामहम् ॥ ३२ ॥

Sargāṇām-ādir-antaśca madhyam caivāham-Arjuna
Adhyātma-vidya vidyānām vādaḥ pravadatām-aham

32. Of creations, I am the beginning and the end and also the middle; of all knowledges, the knowledge of the Self; and *Vāda* of disputants am I.

Of creations, manifestations, *I am the beginning and the end and also the middle.* I am the source, they stay, and the dissolution (of all evolution). At the commencement (verse 20), it has been stated that the Lord is the beginning, the end, etc. of all beings, those presided over by the jīva, i.e. sentient beings alone; while, here, creation in its entirety is referred to; that is the distinction.

Of all knowledge, I am the knowledge of the Self[47], it is the most important, because it is the means to liberation (mokṣa).

And Vāda of disputants am I: By 'disputants', we have to understand the three kinds of disputation, namely "vāda",

47. '*Adhyātma-vidya*' is that Knowledge which manifests in one's/Self (*ātmani*) as the fulfilment or final transmutation (*pariṇati*? of the inner-sense (*antaḥ-karṇa*) and dispels ignorance (*avidyā*). (Ā) See Com. on verse 11 and note 19 thereto.

"jalpa", and "vitaṇḍa"[48], engaged in by them. Among them, "Vāda" is the best, since it (alone) leads to the ascertainment of the true import; and so, 'I am that'.

अक्षराणामकारोऽस्मि द्वन्द्वः सामासिकस्य च ।
अहमेवाक्षयः कालो धाताऽहं विश्वतोमुखः ॥ ३३ ॥

Akṣarāṇām-akāro(a)smi dvandvaḥ sāmāsikasya ca
Aham-evākṣayaḥ kālo dhātā(a)ham viśvatomukhaḥ

33. Of letters, the letter " A " am I: ; and 'dvanḍva" of all compounds; Myself the inexhaustible Time; I the all-faced Dispenser.

Of letters, syllables, the letter " A " am I; *and "dvandva* samāsa "*am I of all*, of the whole class of, *compounds*[49]. And

48. '*Vāda*' is discussion, devoid of bias, with the object of arriving at the truth. (Ā) (*Vāde vāde jāyate tattva-bodhaḥ*). '*Jalpa*' is the assertion of one's own opinion and attempting to refute that of the adversary by an over-bearing reply or wrangling rejoinder, irrespective of which is right and which is wrong. '*Vitaṇda*' is idle carping at the arguments of another, without trying to establish the opposite side of the question. (*prati-pakṣa-sthāpanā-hinaḥ*).

49. *Samāsas* (i.e. compounds, in Saṃskṛt) are of four kinds: (1) *Dvandva*, (2) *Tat-puruṣa*, (3) *Bahu-vrīhi*, and (4) *Avyayībhāva*. (The two classes, *Karma-dharāya* and *Dvigu*, are subdivisions of *Tat-puruṣa*):

(1) In *dvandva*, two or more words are joined together, which if not compounded would stand in the same case and be connected by the conjunction 'and' (e.g. "Rāma-Lakṣmaṇa"). In this, the components carry equal emphasis.

(2) In *Tat-puruṣa*, the first member determines the sense of the other member, or thelast member is defined or qualified by the first without losing its original independence. (e.g. "Sīta-pati". The emphasis is on the second word.

(3) In *Bahu-vrīhi*, two or more nouns in apposition to each other are compounded, the attributive member (whether a noun or an adjective) being placed first, and made to qualify another substantive, and neither of the two members separately—but the sense of the whole compound—qualifies that substantive. (e.g. "Bahu-vrīhi"—possessing much rice). This compound is adjuectival in character, but there are several instances of *Bahu-vrthi* compounds, which have come to be regarded and used as nouns (e.g. "Cakrapāni," "Śaśi-śekhara, "Catur-mukha"). The compounded whole signifies an object other than the meaning of the components.

(4) *Avyayi-bhāva* is an adverbial or indeclinable compound formed of an indeclinable i.e. a preposition or an adverb, and a noun. (e.g. "Adhi-Hari"—in Hari). The emphasis lies on the first word.

In Karma-dhāraya, the members are in apposition. (e.g. "Maheśa"—Māhan+Īśā). In *Dvigu*, the first member is a numeral.

besides, I *Myself* am *the inexhaustible Time*, that which is known as 'kṣaṇa' (moment), and so on;—or I am the Supreme Lord (Parameśvara) who is Kāla (the Reckoner or Destroyer) even of Kāla (Time or Death). *I am the all-faced*, having faces on all sides, *Dispenser* of the fruits of actions to the entire universe.

मृत्युः सर्वहरश्चाहमुद्भवश्च भविष्यताम् ।
कीर्तिः श्रीर्वाक्च नारीणां स्मृतिर्मेधा धृतिः क्षमा ॥ ३४ ॥

Mṛtyuḥ sarva-haraścāham-udbhavaśca bhaviṣyatām
Kīrtiḥ śrīr-vākca nārīṇām smṛtir-medhā dhṛtiḥ kṣamā

34. And I am the all-seizing Death; and the prosperity of those who are to be prosperous; of the feminine (qualities), (I am) Fame, Fortune, and Speech, Memory Intellgience, Constancy and Forbearance.

And I am the all-seizing Death: Death (Destroyer) is of two sorts—he who seizes wealth, etc., and he who seizes life. I am, He wo seizes both. Or, I am the Supreme Lord who seizes all, because of seizing everything at the time of dissolution ("pralaya"). *And* I am *the prosperity*, as also the means of attaining it;—of whom? *of those who are to be prosperous* in the future, those who deserve to attain to eminence. *Of the feminine (qualities) I am Fame, Fortune, and Speech, Memory, Intelligence, Constancy and Forbearance*: these are the best of the feminine, by having even a semblance of which people consider themselves as having gained their object (feel satisfied).

बृहत्साम तथा सम्नां गायत्री छन्दसामहम् ।
मासानां मार्गशीर्षोऽहमृतूनां कुसुमाकरः ॥ ३५ ॥

Bṛhatsāma tathā sāmnām Gāyatrī chandasām-aham
Māsānām mārgaśīrṣo(a)ham ṛtūnām kusumākaraḥ

35. Also, of *Sāmans* (Vedic hymns), I am the *Brhat-Sāman*; of metres, Gāyatri am I; of months, I am Mārga-sīrṣa; of seasons, the flowery season.

Also, of Sāmans, I am the Bṛhat-Saman, the chief of them; *of metres*, of the Ṛks (Vedic mantras) composed in Gāyatrī and other metres, *I am* the *Gāyatrī* Ṛk[50]; *of months, I am Mārgaśirsa*[51]; *of seasons, the flowery season*, (i.e.)Vasanta, the spring[52].

द्यूतं छलयतामस्मि तेजस्तेजस्विनामहम् ।
जयोऽस्मि व्यवसायोऽस्मि सत्त्वं सत्त्ववतामहम् ॥ ३६ ॥

Dyūtam chalayatām-asmi tejas-tejasvinām-aham
Jayo(a)smi vyavasyāo(a)smi sattvam sattvavatām-aham

36. I am the gambling of the fraudulent; I am the majesty of the majestic; I am victory; I am effort; I am (the) *Sattva* of the *sāttvic*.

I am the gambling, such as dice-play, *of the fraudulent*, those who practise deception; *I am the majesty*[53] *of the majestic*, *I am* the *victory* of the victorious; *I am the effort* of those who make an effort; *I am sattva*[54] *of the sāttvic*.

वृष्णीनां वासुदेवोऽस्मि पाण्डवानां धनञ्जयः ।
मुनीनामप्यहं व्यासः कवीनामुशना कविः ॥ ३७ ॥

Vṛṣṇīnām Vāsudevo(a)smi Pāṇḍavānām Dyanañjayaḥ
Munīnām-apyaham Vyāsaḥ kavīnām-Uśanā kaviḥ

50. Because it (initiation into the Gayatri) brings about the second birth of the twice-born. (Ā)
51. as being the month when corn becomes ripe. (Ā)
52. as being delightful. (Ā)
53. irresistable command. (Ā)
54. i.e. the effects of *sattva*, such as righteousness *dharma*), knowledge (*jñāna*), and dispassion (*vairāgya*). (Ā)

37. Of the Vṛṣṇis, I am Vāsudeva; of the Pāṇḍavas, Dhanañjaya; and also, of the *Munis*, I am Vyāsa; of the sages, Uśanas the sage.

Of the Vṛṣṇis, I am Vāsudeva, this Myself, your friend; *of the Pāṇḍavas, Dhanañjaya*, yourself,; *and, also, of the Munis*, those who are devoted to meditation and who know all things, *I am Vyāṣa*; *of the sages*, those who are omniscient, *I am Uśanas*[55] *the sage*.

दण्डो दमयतामस्मि नीतिरस्मि जिगीषताम् ।
मौनं चैवास्मि गुह्यानां ज्ञानं ज्ञानवतामहम् ॥ ३८ ॥

Daṇḍo damāyatam-asmi nītir-asmi jīgīṣatām
Maunam caivāsmi guhyānām jñānām jñānavatām-aham

38. Of those that punish, I am the sceptre; of those who seek to conquer, I am the policy; and, also, of things secret, I am the silence; and the Knowledge of the Knowers am I.

Of punishers, those that chastise, *I am the sceptre*, which subdues the unrestrained[56]; *of those* who *seek to comquer, I am the, policy*; *and, also, of things secret*, those which have to be guarded *I am the silence*; *and the Knowledge*[57] *of Knowers am I*.

यच्चापि सर्वभूतानां बीजं तदहमर्जुन ।
न तदस्ति विना यत्स्यान्मया भूतं चराचरम् ॥ ३९ ॥

Yaccāpi sarva-bhūtānām bījam tad-aham-Arjuna
Na tad-asti vinā yat-syān-mayā bhūtam carācaram

55. Śukrācārya (Ā)—the preceptor of the Asuras.

56. Those who go astray on the wrong path. (Ā)

57. The true Knowledge (*samyag-jñāna*), which arises on the ripening of *samādhi*, through *śravaṇa* and the rest. (Ā)

39. And whatsoever is the seed of all beings, that also am I, O Arjuna. There is no being, whether moving or un-moving, that can exist without Me.

And whatsoever is the seed, the cause of germination, *of all beings, that also am I, O Arjuna.*

(And now) by way of concluding the present section (topic), the Lord summarises His glory (vibhūti) as follows: *There is no being, whether moving or un-moving, that can exist without Me.* That which is bereft of Me, or that which I have abandoned, would be without Self and would verily be non-existent (śūnya); wherefore, everything is of the nature of Myself[58] (or, has Me[58] as its Self.)

नान्तोऽस्ति मम दिव्यानां विभूतीनां परन्तप ।
एष तूद्देशतः प्रोक्तो विभूतेर्विस्तरो मया ॥ ४० ॥

Nānto(a)sti mama dvyānām vibhūtīnām parantapa
Eṣa tūddeśataḥ prokto vibhūter-vistaro mayā

40. There is no end of My divine glories, O scorcher of foes; but, this detailed description of My glory has been narrated by Me only by way of illustration.

There is no end of My divine glories, My manifold extensions. Verily, it is impossible for anybody to describe or understand the true extent of the divine glories (amnifestations) of the Lord, Who is the Self of all. *But, this detailed description of My glory has been narrated by Me only by way illustration*, i.e. partially.

यद्यद्विभूतिमत्सत्त्वं श्रीमदूर्जितमेव वा ।
तत्तदेवावगच्छ त्वं मम तेजोंऽशसंभवम् ॥ ४१ ॥

Yad-yad-vibhūtimat-sattvam śrīmad-ūrjitam-eva vā
Tat-tad-evāvagaccha tvam mama tejo(a)mśa-sambyavam

58. Who is Sat-cit—Ānanda (Ā); i.e., Truth-Knowledge-Bliss.

41. Whatever being there is, glorious, prosperous, or powerful, that know you to be a product of a part of My splendour.

Whatever being, object, *there is* in the world, which is *glorious*, possessed of magnificence, *prosperous*, affluent or lustrous[59], *or powerful*, possessed of energy, *that, know you, to be a product of a part of My splendour*, the splendour of the Lord (Īśvara).

अथवा बहुनैतेन किं ज्ञातेन तवार्जुन ।
विष्टभ्याहमिदं कृत्स्नमेकांशेन स्थितो जगत् ॥ ४२ ॥

Atyavā bahunaitena kim jñānena tavārjuna
Viṣṭabhyāham-idam kṛsnam ekāṁśena sthito jagat

42. Or what avails you to know all this diversity, O Arjuna. I exist, supporting this whole world, by a part of Myself.

Or what avails you to know all this diversity, such as that detailed above, which is incomplete, *O Arjuna*? Listen now to the truth which I shall tell you completely: *I exist, supporting*, sustaining, firmly *this whole world, by a part of Myself*, by one limb, by one foot (quarter—"pāda"), which comprises all beings, as stated by the Mantra: "All beings form His foot (quarter)" (R.V. X. 90.3)[60]

59. *Śrī* is interpreted as *Lakṣhmi* by the Commentator. Śri or Lakshmi is the consort of Viṣṇu and She is the personification of prosperity, affluence, lustre, beauty and auspiciousness.

60. The manifold glories of the Lord are taught for being meditated upon and understood. After pointing out to this form of the Lord comprising the entire universe (which is but His one quarter), the continuation of the *mantra*, "Three-quarters of His, the Immortal, in heaven", referring to the Reality which transcends the universe and is un-conditioned, determines the implied import of '*Tat*' (the Goal "That" in the Maha-vākya) as the Whole, the Sat-Cit-Ānanda. (Ā)

इति श्रीमहाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्यां
भीष्मपर्वणि श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु
ब्रह्मविद्यायां योगशास्त्रे श्रीकृष्णार्जुन-
संवादे विभूति योगो नाम
दशमोऽध्यायः ॥

Iti Śrī Mayābhārate śata-sāhasryām saṁhitāyām Vaiyāsikyām Bhīṣma-Parvaṇi Śrīmad Bhagavad-Gītāsūpaniṣatsu Brahma-vidyāyām yoga śāstre Śrī Kṛṣṇārjuna-samvāde Vibhūti-yoga nāma-daśamo(a)dhyāyaḥ.

Thus the tenth chapter entitled ' Mode of Divine Glory' in the Upaniṣads known as ' The Celebrated Songs of the Lord' expounding the Knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna—embodied in the Bhīṣma-Parva of Śrī Mahābhārata, the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyasa.

॥ एकादशोऽध्यायः ॥
(विश्वरूप दर्शनम्)

EKADASO(A)DHYAYAḤ

(*VIŚVARŪPA DARŚANAM*)

CHAPTER - XI

(VISION OF THE UNIVERSAL FORM)

The glories (manifestations) of the Lord have been described. Having heard the Lord's statement therein. "I exist, supporting this whole world by a part of Myself" (X-42), and desirous of seeing with his own eyes that Primal Form of the Lord, which is manifested as the universe,—

अर्जुन उवाच —

मदनुग्रहाय परमं गुह्यमध्यात्मसंज्ञितम् ।
यत्त्वयोक्तं वचस्तेन मोहोऽयं विगतो मम ॥ १ ॥

Arjuda uvāca—

Mad-anugrahāya paramam guhyam-adhyātma-samjñitam
Yat-tvayoktam vacas-tena moho(a)yam vigato mama

Arjuna said—

1. By the words, on the supreme secret, called Adhyātma, which have been spoken by Thee out of compassion towards me, this, my delusion, is gone.

By the words, on the supreme, unsurpassed, *secret* that has to be guarded, *called Adhyātma,* treating of the distinction between the Self and the non-Self, *which have been spoken by Thee, out*

of compassion towards me, with the object of favouring me, *this, my delusion, is gone*: my want of discrimination has been removed.

Also,

भवाप्ययौ हि भूतानां श्रुतौ विस्तरशो मया ।
त्वत्तः कमलपत्राक्ष माहात्म्यमपि चाव्ययम् ॥ २ ॥

Bhavāpyayau hi bhūtānām śrutan vistaraśo mayā
Tvattaḥ Vamala-patrākṣa māhātmyam-api cāvyayam

2. Of thee, O Lotus-eyed, I have heard in detail, of the origin and the dissolution of beings, as also (Thy) inexhaustible greatness.

Of thee, from Thee, *O Lotus-eyed*, O Thou having eyes resembling the petals of the lotus, *I have heard in detail*, i.e. not in brevity *of the origin*, the manifestation, *and the dissolution*, the disappearance, *of beings, as also* (*Thy*) *inexhaustible*, ever-lasting' *greatness*[1].

एवमेतद्यथात्थ त्वमात्मानं परमेश्वर ।
द्रष्टुमिच्छामि ते रूपमैश्वरं पुरुषोत्तम ॥ ३ ॥

Evam-etad-yathāttha tvam-ātmānam Parameśvara
Draṣṭum-icchāmi te rūpam-aiśvaram Puruṣottama

3. So it is as Thou, O Supreme Lord, hast declared Thyself. (Still) I desire to see Thy Iśvara-Form, O Puruṣa Supreme.

1. *Māhātmyam*, which is translated as " greatness ", also means "the nature of the Mahātman ",i.e. the Great Spirit—the Absolute and the conditioned. (Ā)

O Supreme Lord, so it is,—it is not otherwise—, *as Thou hast declared Thyself*, in the manner Thou hast been describing Thyself. Still, *I desire to see Thy Īśvara-Form*, the form of Viṣṇu, fully possessed of knowledge, sovereignty, power, strength, valour and splendour, *O Puruṣa Supreme.*

मन्यसे यदि तच्छक्यं मया द्रष्टुमिति प्रभो ।
योगेश्वर ततो मे त्वं दर्शयात्मानमव्ययम् ॥ ४ ॥

Manyase yadi tacchakyam mayā draṣṭum-iti prabho
Yogeśvara tato me tvam darśayātmānam-avyayam

4. If Thou, O Lord, thinkest me capable of seeings it, then, O Lord of Yogins, show me Thy immutable Self.

If thou, O Lord, Master, *thinkest*, dost consider, *me* Arjuna, *capable of seeing it, then,* because I am extremely desirous of seeing it, *O Lord of Yogins, show me Thy immutable Self.*

Pressed with such a request by Arjuna.

श्री भगवानुवाच —
पश्य मे पार्थ रूपाणि शतशोऽथ सहस्रशः ।
नानाविधानि दिव्यानि नानावर्णाकृतीनि च ॥ ५ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Paśya me Pārtha rūpāṇi śataśo(a)tha sahasraśaḥ
Nānāvidhāni divyāni nāṇāvarṇākṛtīni ca

The Blessed Lord said—

5. Behold, O Pārtha, by the hundred and by the thousand, My different forms, celestial, of various colours and shapes.

Behold, O Pārtha, by the hundred and by the thousand, i.e. in very large numbers, *My different*, manifold, *forms, celestial*, supernatural, *of various colours and shapes*, of different colours—blue, yellow, etc.—and shapes, i.e. configurations of limbs (parts).

पश्यादित्यान्वसून्रुद्रानश्विनौ मरुतस्तथा ।
बहून्यदृष्टपूर्वाणि पश्याश्चर्याणि भारत ॥ ६ ॥

Paśyādityān-Vasūn-Rudrān-Aśvinau Marutas-tathā
Bahūnyadṛṣṭa-pūrvāṇi pasyāscaryāṇi Bhārata

6. Behold the Ādityas, the Vasus, the Rudras, the Aśvins, and the Maruts; also behold, O Bhārata, many marvels that have never been seen before.

Behold the twelve *Ādityas*, the eight *Vasus, the* eleven *Rudras, the* two *Aśvins*[2], *and the* seven groups, of seven *Maruts*; and *also behold, O Bhārata, many* other *marvels*, wonders, *that have never been seen before* in this world of men, by you or anyone else.

Not that much alone:

इहैकस्थं जगत्कृत्स्नं पश्याद्य सचराचरम् ।
मम देहे गुडाकेश यच्चान्यद्द्रष्टुमिच्छसि ॥ ७ ॥

Ihaikastham jagat-kṛtsnam paśyādya sacarācaram
Mama dehe Guḍākeśa yaccānyad-draṣṭum-icchasi

7. See now, O Guḍākeśa, in this My body, the whole universe, established in one, with (its) moving and immovable (objects); and whatever else you desire to see.

See now, O Guḍākeśa, in this My body, the whole universe, the universe in its entirety, *established in one* spot (i.e. as part of

2. Sons of Sūrya (the Sun-god) by Saṃjñā. (*V.P.* III. ii.7). They are the physicians of the gods.

My body), *with its moving* creatures *and immovable objects*; *and whatever else*, such as your success or defeat (in the coming war) about which you have expressed the doubt, " whether we shall win or whether they will conquer us'' (II-6) , that also, if *you desire to see.*

But,

न तु मां शक्यसे द्रष्टमनेनैव स्वचक्षुषा ।
दिव्यं ददामि ते चक्षुः पश्य मे योगमैश्वरम् ॥ ८॥

Na tu mām śakyase draṣṭum-anenaiva sva-cakṣuṣā
Divyam dadāmi te cakṣuḥ paśya me yogam-aiśvaram

8. You are not indeed capable of seeing Me with merely this eye of yours; I give you the divine eye; (with it,) behold My lordly *Yoga*.[3]

You are not indeed capable of seeing Me, putting on the Universal Form, *with merely this eye of yours*, which is ordinary (prākṛta—natural, unrefined); *I give you the divine eye*, by which you shall be able to see Me; by that eye, *behold My lordly Yoga*, that which belongs to Me the Īśvara (Lord), and which is the pre-eminent Yoga-Power (" yoga-śakti)).

सञ्जय उवाच —
एवमुक्त्वा ततो राजन्महायोगेश्वरो हरिः ।
दर्शयामास पर्थाय परमं रूपमैश्वरम् ॥ ९॥

3. The direct meaning of *Yoga* is " Union ". As such, the *Viśva-rupa* (Universal Form) in which is effected the "Union" of Iśvara with the manifold creation is His Yoga. Or—one among the many other meanings of *Yoga* is "magic". The One-without-a-second putting on the *Māyā*-form of *Viśva-rūpa* enfolding the manifold creation is the Magic of magics, and is therefore *Yoga*. Or—it is *Yoga* also in the sense of being "a way to the Union with God (Ātman, Brahman)", the sense in which most of the Chapters of the *Gīta* are titled as Yoga; since, in the Lord's own words (verse 54) knowing this Form itself confers "entry into" Him.

Sañjaya uvāca—

Evam-uktvā tato rājan-mahayogesvaro Hariḥ
Darśayāmsāsa Pārthāya paramam rūpam-aiśvaram

Sañjaya said—

9. Having thus spoken, O King! Hari, the great Lord of *Yoga*, then showed to Pārtha His Supreme Īśvara-Form.

(The sentence is continued and completed in verse 11.)

Having spoken thus, as stated above, *O King*, Dhṛtarāṣṭral *Hari*[4], Nārāyāṇa, *the great Lord of Yoga*, i.e. He Who is great and is also the Lord of *Yoga*, *then*, immediately thereafter, *showed to Pārtha*, the son of Pṛthā. *His Supreme Īśvara-Form*, the Universal Form

अनेकवक्त्रनयनमनेकाद्भुतदर्शनम् ।
अनेकदिव्याभरणं दिव्यानेकोद्यतायुधम् ॥ १० ॥

Aneka-vaktra-nayanam-anekādbhuta-darśanam
Aneka-divyābharaṇam divyānekodyatāyudham

10. With numerous mouths and eyes, with numerous wondorous sights, with numerous celestial ornaments, with numerous celestial weapons uplifted;

With numerous mouths and eyes: in that Form were many mouths and eyes; *with numerous wondorous sights*: in that Form were many astonishing aspects; *with numerous celestial ornaments, with numerous celestial weapons*, such as the sword, *uplifted*, held up; such a Form He showed.

4. "Hari": (1) He who destroys the sin or (even) the transmigratory existence (*saṁsāra*) of beings, on merely being thought of; (2) He who is greenish in colour. *V.S.*Com. 359); (3) He who destroys *saṁsāra* with its cause (namely *avidyā*) (*V.S.* Com. 650). (Ā)

As also,

दिव्यमाल्याम्बरधरं दिव्यगन्धानुलेपनम् ।
सर्वाश्चर्यमयं देवमनन्तं विश्वतोमुखम् ॥ ११ ॥

Divya-mālyāmbara-dharam divya-gandhānulepanam
Sarvāścarya-mayam devam-anantam viśvato mukham

11. Wearing celestial garlands and apparel, anointed with celestial scented unguents, the All-wonderful Resplendent, Boundless, with faces on every side,.

wearing celestial garlands and apparel: Him, namely the Lord (Īśvara), by Whom celestial garlands of flowers and clothes were worn; Him, who was *anointed with celestial-scented unguents, the All-wonderful, Resplendent, Boundless, with faces on every side*, everywhere, He being the Self of all beings:

This form of Him He showed, and Arjuna saw.

Now, with respect of the splendour of the Lord's Universal Form, a comparison is stated:

दिवि सूर्यसहस्रस्य भवेद्युगपदुत्थिता ।
यदि भाः सदृशी सा स्याद्भासस्तस्य महात्मनः ॥ १२ ॥

Divi sūrya-sahasrasya bhaved-yugapad-utthitā
Yadi bhāḥ sadṛśi sā syād-bhāsas-tasya mahātmanaḥ

12. If the splendour of a thousand suns were to rise up at once in the sky, that would be like the splendour of that Mighty Being.

If the splendour of a thousand simultaneously-rising *suns were to rise up at once in the sky*, in the immediate region between the earth and heven (antarikṣa), or in the heaven which is the third

world (from the earth), *that would be like* (somewhat comparable to) *the splendour of that Mighty Being*, namely the Universal Form. And, if such (phenomenon) cannot occur, even then the splendour of the Universal Form will surpass it (the phenomenon imagined): that is the implication.

And,

तत्रैकस्थं जगत्कृत्स्नं प्रविभक्तमनेकधा ।
अपश्यद्देवदेवस्य शरीरे पाण्डवस्तदा ॥ १३ ॥

Tatraikastham jagat-kṛtsnam pravibhaktam-anekadhā
Apaśyad-deva devasya śarīre Pāṇḍavas-tadā

13. There, in the body of the God of gods, the son of Pāṇḍu then saw the whole universe resting together, with its manifold divisions.

There, in the Universal Form, *the body of* Hari, *the God of gods, the son of Paṇḍu*, Arjuna, *then saw the whole universe resting together*, established in one place, *with its manifold divisions*, distinctions such as Devas, Pitṛs, men, etc.

ततः स विस्मयाविष्टो हृष्टरोमा धनञ्जयः ।
प्रणम्य शिरसा देवं कृताञ्जलिरभाषत ॥ १४ ॥

TaTaḥ sa vismayāviṣṭo hṛṣṭa romā Dhanañjayaḥ
Praṇamya śirasa devam kṛtānjalir-abhāṣata

14. Then, he, Dhananjaya, filled with wonder, with his hair standing on end, bowing down with his head to God, spoke with palms joined.

Then, on seeing Him, *he, Dhanañjaya*, became *filled with wonder, with his hair standing on end. Bowing down with his head* bending down his head exceedingly low and becoming humble,

to the God who had put on the Universal Form, he *spoke with palms joined*, in respectful obeisance.

In what manner—manifesting his personal experience, namely, that he was seeing that Universal Form which was shown by the Lord—(did he speak)?

अर्जुन उवाच—

पश्यामि देवांस्तव देव देहे सर्वांस्तथा भूतविशेषसंघान् ।
ब्रह्माणमीशं कमलासनस्थमृषींश्च सर्वानुरगांश्च दिव्यान् ॥ १५ ॥

Arjuna uvāca—

Paśyāmi devāṁs-tava deva dehe sarvāṁs-tatha
bhūta-viśeṣa-saṁghān
Brahmāṇam-Īśam Kamalāsanasthamṛṣīṁśca
sarvān-uragāṁśca divyān

Arjuna said—

15. I see all the gods, O God, in Thy body, and hosts of all grades of beings; Brahmā, the Lord, seated on the lotus-seat, and all the Ṛṣis and celestial serpents.

I see, directly perceive, *all the gods, O God, in Thy body, and hosts of all grades of beings*, both inanimate and animate, of multifarious forms; and what else?—*Brahmā, the Lord*, the Four-faced Lord of creatures, *seated on the lotus-seat*, seated on the Meru the pericarp, in the middle of the Earth-lotus; *and all the Ṛṣis*, Vasiṣṭha and the rest, *and celestial serpents*, such as Vāsuki, residing in heaven.

अनेकबाहूदरवक्त्रनेत्रं पश्यामि त्वां सर्वतोऽनन्तरूपम् ।
नान्तं न मध्यं न पुनस्तवादिं पश्यामि विश्वेश्वर विश्वरूप ॥ १६ ॥

Aneka-bābhūdara-vaktra-netram paśyāmi tvām
sarvato(a)nanta-rūpam

Nāntam na madhyam na punas-tavādim paśyāmi viśveśvara viśva-rūpa

16. I see Thee of boundless form on every side, with manifold arms, bellies, mouths and eyes; neither the end nor the middle, nor also the beginning of Thee do I see, O Lord of the universe, O Universal Form.

I see Thee of boundless form on every side, that is, the forms (seen) are limitless everywhere, *with manifold arms, bellies, mouths and eyes*; *neither the end*, termination, *nor the middle,* what lies between the two extremities, *nor also the beginning, of Thee do I see*; i.e. I do not see the end of Thee, the Lord, nor do I see the middle, nor again the beginning, *O Lord of the Universe, O Universal Form.*

Moreover,

किरीटिनं गदिनं चक्रिणं च तेजोराशिं सर्वतो दीप्तिमन्तम् ।
पश्यामि त्वां दुर्निरीक्ष्यं समन्ताद्दीप्तानलार्कद्युतिमप्रमेयम् ॥ १७॥

Kirītinam gadinam cakriṇam ca tejo-rāśin sarvato-dīptimantam

Paśyami tvām dur-nrīkṣyam samantād-diptānalārka-dyutim-aprameyam

17. I see Thee with diadem, mace, and discus; a mass of radiance shining everywhere, very hard to look at, blazing all round like burning fire and sun, and immeasurable.

I see Thee with diadem, kirIta, a particular ornament for the head, *mace, and discus*; *a mass of radiance, shining everywhere, very hard to look at,* which can be seen only with much difficulty, *blazing all round,* everywhere, *like burning fire and sun, and immeasurable* and whose limit cannot be ascertained.

From this vision of Thy Power of Yoga (*yoga-śakti*), I infer—

त्वमक्षरं परमं वेदितव्यं त्वमस्य विश्वस्य परं निधानम् ।
त्वमव्ययः शाश्वतधर्मगोप्ता सनातनस्त्वं पुरुषो मतो मे ॥ १८ ॥

Tvam-akṣaram paramam veditavyam tvam-asya viśvasya param nidhānam

Tvam-avyayaḥ śāśvata dharma-gopta sanātanas-tvam puruṣo mato me

18. Thou art the Imperishable, the Supreme, the (one) thing to be known. Thou art the great Abode of this universe; Thou art the undying Guardian of the Eternal Dharma, Thou art the Ancient Puruṣa, I ween.

Thou art the Imperishable, the Supreme Brahman, *the* one *thing to be known* by those who seek liberation. *Thou art the great Abode*, the receptacle, that is to say, the Supreme resting place, *of this universe* in its entirety. What else? *Thou art the undying Guardian of the Eternal Dharma*[5], *Thou art the Ancient* Supreme *Purusa*; *I ween*: this is my conviction.

Moreover,

अनादिमध्यान्तमनन्तवीर्यमनन्तबाहुं शशिसूर्यनेत्रम् ।
पश्यामि त्वां दीप्तहुताशवक्त्रं स्वतेजसा विश्वमिदं तपन्तम् ॥१९॥

Anādi-madhyāntam-ananta-vīryam ananta-bāhum śaśi-sūrya-netram

Paśyāmi tvām dīpta-hutāśa-vaktram sva-tejasā viśvam-idam tapantam

5. as has been said by the Lord Himself: "For the firm establishment of dharma, I come into being" (IV-8). (Ā)

19. I see Thee without beginning, middle, or end, infinite in valour, of manifold arms; (having) the sun and the moon (as) Thine eyes, the burning fire (as) Thy mouth; scorching this whole universe with Thy radiance.

I see Thee without beginning, middle, or end: I see Thee, of whom the beginning, middle, or end, are not visible, *infinite in valour*, for whose valour there is no limit, *of manifold arms*, whose arms are innumerable; *the sun and the moon Thine eyes, the burning fire Thy mouth*; *scorching this whole universe with Thy radiance*

द्यावापृथिव्योरिदमन्तरं हि व्याप्तं त्वयैकेन दिशश्च सर्वाः ।
दृष्ट्वाद्भुतं रूपमुग्रं तवेदं लोकत्रयं प्रव्यथितं महात्मन् ॥ २० ॥

Dyāvā-pṛthivyor-idam-antaram hi vyāptam
tvayaikena diśaśca sarvāḥ

Dṛṣṭvādbhutam rūpam-ugram tavedam loka-trayam
pravyathitam mahātman

20. This space, betwixt heaven and earth, and all the quarters are filled by Thee alone; having seens this, Thy marvellous and awful form, the three worlds are trembling, O Great-souled One.

This space betwixt heaven and earth, namely, the "antarikṣa", *and all the quarters are filled by Thee alone*, Who hast put on the Universal Form; *having seen this, Thy marvellous*, astonishing' *and awful*, fierce, *the three worlds are trembling*, frightened' or or agitated, *O Great-souled One*, O Thou of noble nature.

At first, Arjuna had the doubt, 'whether we shall win or whether they will conquer us' (II-6). Now, therefore, to remove it, the Lord proceeds to reveal the assured success of the Pāṇḍavas, On seeing Him so, Arjuna continues:

अमी हि त्वा सुरसंघा विशन्ति केचिद्भीतः प्राञ्जलयो गृणन्ति ।
स्वस्तीत्युक्त्वा महर्षिसिद्धसंघाः स्तुवन्ति त्वां स्तुतिभिः पुष्कलाभिः ॥

Amī hi tvā sura-saṁghā viśanti kecit-bhītaḥ prāññjalayo gṛṇanti
Svastītuktvā maharṣi-siddha-saṁghaḥ stuvanti tvām stutibhiḥ puṣkālabhiḥ

21. Verily into Thee enter these hosts of the gods; some, in fear, extol Thee with joined palms; saying "May it be well", bands of great Ṛṣis and Siddhas praise Thee with abundant hymns.

Verily into Thee are seen to *enter these hosts of the gods*, the warriors now engaged in fighting, all of them being the hosts of gods such as the Vasus and others, who have incarnated themselves in human forms for lightening the earth's burden[6]. *Some* of them being *in fear, extol Thee with joined palms*, they being incapable of fleeing even. (The commencement of the Mahābharata) War being near and observing signs such as portents foreboding calamity, and *saying "May it be well* for the world", *bands of great Ṛṣis and Siddhas praise Thee with abundant*, complete, *hymns*.

And also,

रुद्रादित्या वसवो ये च साध्या विश्वेऽश्विनौ मरुतश्चोष्मपाश्च ।
गन्धर्वयक्षासुरसिद्धसंघा वीक्षन्ते त्वां विस्मिताश्चैव सर्वे ॥ २२ ॥

Rudrādityā vasavo ye ca sādhyā viśve(a) śvinau marutaścoṣmampāśca

6. The phrase "*tvāsurasaṁghā*" is split here as "*tvā surasaṁghā*". It also lends itself to be split as "*tvā asurasaṁghā*", "*asurasaṁgha*" meaning "hosts of demons', in which case the text can be interpreted as referring to the demoniac. Duryodhana and his followers, who entered into the Lord on their destruction. They were the unbearable burden on Mother Earth, whom the celestials-turned-humans (Pāṇḍavas and their followers etc.) destroyed as the instruments of the Lord.

Gandharva-yakṣāsura-siddha-saṁghā vīkṣante
tvām vismitāścaiva sarve

22. The Rudras, Ādityas, Vasus, and Sādhyas, Viśvedevas, and Aśvins, Maruts and Ūṣmapas, hosts of Gandharvas, Yakṣas, Asuras and Siddhas,—they are all looking at Thee, all quite astounded.

The groups of *Rudras, Ādityas, Vasus, and Sādhyas*, the *Viśvedevas, and* the twin-gods, *Aśvins, Maruts, and Ūṣmapas*, [Pitrs, *hosts of Gandharvas*, Hāhā, Hūhū and others, *Yakṣas*, Kubera and others, *Asuras*, Virocana and the rest, *Siddhas*, Kapila and others,—*they are all looking at Thee, all quite astounded*, having become amazed.

For,

रूपं महत्ते बहुवक्त्रनेत्रं महाबाहो बहुबाहूरुपादम् ।
बहूदरं बहूदंष्ट्राकरालं दृष्ट्वा लोकाः प्रव्यथितास्तथाऽहम् ॥ २३ ॥

Rūpam mahat-te bahu-vaktra-netram mahābāho
bahū-bāhūru-pādam

Bahūdaram bahu-daṁṣṭrā-karālam dṛṣṭva lokāḥ
pravyathitas-tathā(a)ham

23. O mighty-armed! Having seen Thy immeasurable form, with many mouths and eyes, with many arms, thighs and feet, with many bellies, and fearful with many tusks, the worlds are terrified, and so am I.

O mighty-armed! Having seen Thy immeasurable form, of great magnitude, *with many mouths and eyes*, with many arms, *thighs and feet, with many bellies, and fearful*, hideous, *with many tusks*, on seeing such a form,—*the worlds*, i.e. living creatures of the worlds, *are terrified*, agitated with fear; *and so am I* as well.

The cause (of my fear) is this:

नभःस्पृशं दीप्तमनेकवर्णं व्यात्तानननं दीप्तविशालनेत्रम् ।
दृष्ट्वा हि त्वां प्रव्यथितान्तरात्मा धृतिं न विन्दामि शमं च विष्णो ॥

Nabhaḥ-spṛśam dīptam-aneka-varṇam vyāttānanam dīpta-viśala-netram

Dṛṣṭvā hi tvām pravyathitāntarātmā dhṛtim na vindāmi śamam ca Viṣṇo

24. On seeing Thee touching the sky, shining in many hues, with mouths wide open, with large fiery eyes, I am terrified at heart, and find no courage nor peace, O Viṣṇu.

On seeing Thee, touching the sky, shining in many hues, putting on many fearful shapes, *with mouths wide open, with large fiery eyes, I am terrified at heart*: i.e. my mind (antarātmā) is extremely afraid, *and I find no courage nor peace*, i.e. quietude, comfort of mind. *O Viṣṇu.*

Why?

दंष्ट्राकरालानि च ते मुखानि दृष्ट्वैव कालानलसन्निभानि ।
दिशो न जाने न लभे च शर्म प्रसीद देवेश जगन्निवास ॥ २५ ॥

Damṣṭrā-karālāni ca te mukhāni dṛṣṭvaiva kālānala-sannibhāni

Diśo na jāne na labhe ca śarma prasīda deveśa jagan-nivāsa

25. Having seen Thy mouths, terrible with tusks, and resembling Kālāgni, I know not the (four) quarters, nor do I find peace. Have mercy, O Lord of the Devas, O Abode of the universe!

Having seen Thy mouths, terrible, hideous, *with tusks, and resembling Kālāgni,* the fire which consumes the worlds at the time

of final dissolution (pralaya), *I know not the* (four) *quarters*: I cannot distinguish the east and the west and I am confounded about the different quarters; therefore, *nor do I find peace*, comfort. Hence, *have mercy*, be gracious, *O Lord of the Devas, O Abode of the universe*!

The apprehension I had about possible defeat at the hands of the enemy is also gone for ever, for—

अमी च त्वां धृतराष्ट्रस्य पुत्राः सर्वे सहैवावनिपालसंघैः ।
भीष्मो द्रोणः सूतपुत्रस्तथाऽसौ सहास्मदीयैरपि योधमुख्यैः ॥२६॥

Amī ca tvām Dhṛtarāṣṭrasya putrāḥ-sarve
sahaivāvanipāla-saṁghaiḥ
Bhīṣmo Droṇaḥ-Sūtaputras-tatha(a)sau
sahāsmadīyair-api yodha-mukhyaiḥ

26. And all these sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra, with hosts of monarchs, Bhīṣma, Drona, and that Sūta-putra, with the warrior-chiefs, of ours, as well,

(The sentence is completed in the next verse.)

And all these sons of Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Duryodhana and the others *with hosts of monarchs*, those that rule over the earth, and further *Bhīṣma, Droṇa, and that Sūta-putra*, (son of a charioteer) Karṇa, *with the warrior-chiefs of ours as well*, Dhṛṣṭadyumna and the rest, the chiefs of the soldiers, (enter precipitately into Thy mouth: See next verse.)

वक्त्राणि ते त्वरमाणा विशन्ति दंष्ट्राकरालानि भयानकानि ।
केचिद्विलग्ना दशनान्तरेषु संदृश्यन्ते चूर्णितैरुत्तमाङ्गैः ॥ २७॥

Vaktrāṇi te tvaramāṇā viśanti damṣṭrākarālāni
bhayānakāni
Kecid-vilagnā daśanāntareṣu saṁdṛsyante
cūrnitair-uttamāṅgaiaḥ

27. (They enter precipitately into Thy mouths, terrible with tusks and fearful to behold. Some are found sticking in the interestices of Thy teeth, with their heads crushed to powder.

(They) *enter precipitately into Thy mouths.* How are those mouths?—*Terrible with tusks and fearful to behold.* Moreover, *some*, among those who have entered the mouths, *are found sticking*, like a piece of flesh which has been eaten, *in the interstices of Thy teeth, with their heads* (literally, the best limb of the body), *crushed to powder*, pounded.

How do they enter the mouths? Arjuna says—

यथा नदीनां बहवोम्बुवेगाः समुद्रमेवाभिमुखा द्रवन्ति ।
तथा तवामी नरलोकवीरा विशन्ति वक्त्राण्यभिविज्वलन्ति ॥२८॥

Yathā nadīnām bahavombu-vegāḥ samudram-evābhi-mukhā dravanti

Tathā tavāmī nara-loka-vīrā viśanti vaktrāṇyabhivijvalanti

28. Verily as the many torrents of rivers flow towards the ocean, so do these heroes in the world of men enter Thy mouths fiercely flaming on all sides.

Verily as the many torrents of rivers, waters running with speed, *flow towards the ocean*, enter into it, *so do these heroes in the world of men*, such as Bhīṣma, *enter Thy mouths fiercely flaming on all sides*, which are glowing.

To what end and in what manner do they enter? He (Arjuna) says:

यथा प्रदीप्तं ज्वलनं पतङ्गा विशन्ति नाशाय समृद्धवेगाः ।
तथैव नाशाय विशन्ति लोकास्तवापि वक्त्राणि समृद्धवेगाः ॥२९॥

Yathā pradīptam jvalanam pataṅgā viśanti nāśāya samṛddha-vegāḥ

Tathaiva nāśāya viśanti lokās-tavāpi vaktrāṇi samṛddha-vegaḥ

29. As months rush with precipitous speed into a blazing fire to perish, just so do these creatures also precipitately rush into Thy mouths only to perish.

As moths, winged creatures, *rush with precipitous*, very high *speed into a blazing fire to perish*, to be destroyed, *just so do these creatures* living beings, *also preciptately rush into Thy mouths only to perish.*

And, Thou—

लेलिह्यसे ग्रसमानः समन्ताल्लोकान्समग्रान्वदनैर्ज्वलद्भिः ।
तेजोभिरापूर्य जगत्समग्रं भासस्तवोग्राः प्रतपन्ति विष्णो ॥ ३० ॥

Lelihyase grasamānah samantāl-lokan-samagrān-vadanair-jvaladbhiḥ

Tejobhir-āpūrya jagat-samagram bhāsas-tavogrāḥ pratapanti Viṣṇo

30. (Thou) lickest up, swallowing all the worlds on every side with thy flaming mouths, filling the whole world with radiance. Thy fierce rays are burning, O Viṣṇu!

(Thou) lickest up, tasteth, *swallowing*, taking in, *all the worlds on every side, with Thy flaming mouths, filling the whole world with radiance.* Moreover, *Thy fierce rays*, brilliant beams of heat and light, *are burning*, causing distress, *O Viṣṇu,* the All-pervading One!

Because Thou art so terrible, therefore.,

आख्याहि मे को भवानुग्ररूपो नमोऽस्तु ते देववर प्रसीद।
विज्ञातुमिच्छामि भवन्तमाद्यं न हि प्रजानामि तव प्रवृत्तिम् ॥३१॥

Ākhyāhi me ko bhāvan-ugrarupo namo(a)stu te deva-vara prasīda

Vijñatum-icchāmi bhavantam-ādyam na hi prajānāmi tava pravṛttim

31. Tell me who Thou art, fierce in form. Salutation to Thee, O Deva Supreme; have mercy. I desire to know Thee, the Primeval Being; for, I know not indeed Thy behaviour.

Tell me who Thou art, fierce in such a *form* as this. *Salutation to Thee, O Deva Supreme*, the Foremost among the gods; *have mercy*, be propitious. *I desire to know Thee, the Primeval Being*, clearly, *for*, because, *I cannot indeed know Thy behaviour*, action.

श्री भगवानुवाच—

कालोऽस्मि लोकक्षयकृत्प्रवृद्धो लोकान्समाहर्तुमिह प्रवृत्तः।
ऋतेऽपि त्वा न भविष्यन्ति सर्वे येऽवस्थिताः प्रत्यनीकेषु योधाः ॥

Śri Bhagavān-uvaca

Kālo(a)smi loka-kṣaya-kṛt-pravrddho lokān-samāhartum-iha pravṛttaḥ

Ṛte(a)pi tvā na bhaviṣyanti sarve ye(a)vasthitāḥ pratyanīkesu yodhāḥ

The Blessed Lord said—

32. I am the mighty world-destroying Kāla, here engaged in infolding the worlds. Even without you, none of the warriors arrayed in the hositle armies shall live.

I am the world-destroying Kāla[7], *mighty*, with fully extended power. For what purpose I have grown fully in power, listen: *here*, at the present moment, *engaged in infolding*, destroying, *the worlds. Even without you* (fighting), *none of the warriors*, Bhīṣma, Droṇa, Karṇa and others, about whom (whole death) you are uncertain, *arrayed in* every one of *the hostile armies, shall live*.

Such being the case.

तस्मात्त्वमुत्तिष्ठ यशो लभस्व जित्वा शत्रून्भुङ्क्ष्व राज्यं समृद्धम् ।
मयैवैते निहताः पूर्वमेव निमित्तमात्रं भव सव्यसाचिन् ॥ ३३ ॥

Tasmāt-tvam-uttiṣṭha yaśo labhasva jitvā śatrūn-
bhuṅkṣva rājyam samṛddham
Mayaivaite nihatāḥ pūrvam-eva nimitta-mātram
bhava savya-sācin

33 Therefore, do you arise and acquire fame. Conquering the enemies, enjoy the affluent kingdom. Verily by Myself have they been already slain; be you merely an apparent cause, O Savya-sācin.

Therefore, do you arise, and acquire fame, that Bhīṣma, Droṇa and others, all "ati-rathas", whom even gods cannot vanquish have been defeated by Arjuna; such fame is attained purely as the result of "puṇya" (meritorious action). *Conquering the enemies*, Duryodhana and the rest, *enjoy the affluent kingdom*, unchanged and rid of troubles. *Verily by Myself have they been already slain*, they have surely been deprived of life; *be you merely an apparent cause*, O *Savya-sācin*, Arjuna, who can shoot arrows even with the left hand.

7. "Kāla" is Parameśvara conditioned by the Power of Activity (*Kriyā-śakti*). (Ā). The Universal Form (*Viśva-rūpa*) revealed to Arjuna was that of Īśvara, the Lord of Destruction (*saṁhāra*). That revealed to Yaśoda was that of Viṣṇu (Lord of Preservation, *Sthiti*); that revealed to Brahmā was a combination of Brahmā (Lord of Creation, *Sṛṣṭi*) and Viṣṇu (i.e. of *Sṛṣti* and *Sthiti*); while that shown to duryodhana was a combination of the Viṣṇu and Rudra aspects (*Sthiti* and *Saṁhāra*).

द्रोणं च भीष्मं च जयद्रथं च कर्णं तथाऽन्यानपि योधवीरान् ।
मया हतांस्त्वं जहि मा व्यथिष्ठा युध्यस्व जेतासि रणे सपत्नान् ॥

Droṇam ca Bhīṣmam ca Jayadratham ca Karṇam tathā(a)nyān-api yodhavīrān

Mayā hatams-tvam jahi mā vyathiṣṭhā yudhyasva jetāsi raṇe sapatnān

34. Droṇa and Bhīṣma, and Jayadratha and Karṇa, as well as other brave warriors,—these, killed by Mə, do you kill; and be not distressed with fear. Fight, and you shall conquer your enemies in battle.

The Lord specifically mentions by name every one of the warriors, about (conquering) whom Arjuna was uncertain, as having been (already) killed by Himself. The reason for Arjuna's apprehension as regards *Droṇa and Bhīṣma* is well-known. Droṇa was master of the science of archery (dhanur-veda), was possessed of celestial weapons, and in particular was his own most venerable Guru. Bhīṣma had death at his own free-will and was possessed of celestial weapons; and though (formerly) engaged in single combat with (the sixth Avatar of Viṣṇu) Paraśurāma, remained unvanquished. So also Jayadratha[8]: his father[9] was engaged in penance with the object, "whoever causes my son's head to fall on the ground, the head of that person also shall fall". *Karṇa* also[10]; and besides, he was possessed of an unfailing Śakti

8. i.e. he was also possessed or celestial weapons. (Ā). Jayadratha had married Dhṛtarāṣṭra's only daughter Duḥśalā. He was killed by Arjuna on the fourteenth day of the war.

9. Vṛddha-kṣatra, ruler of Sind, Arjuna caused the head of Jayadratha to fall in the lap of Vṛddha-kṣatra, who , unaware that it was his own son's head, immediately threw it on the ground and then caused the fall of his own head as per a curse.

0. i.e. he was also possessed of celestial weapons. (Ā)

(spear) given to him by Indra; was a son of the Sun-god, born of a maiden[11]; wherefore, he is (also) mentioned by name[12].

(All) *these (already) killed by Me, do yoy kill*, merely as the apparent cause (as My tool); *and be not distressed with fear*, do not fear from them. *Fight, and you shall conquer your enemies*, Duryodhana and the rest, *in battle.*

सञ्जय उवाच—

एतच्छ्रुत्वा वचनं केशवस्य कृताञ्जलिर्वेपमानः किरीटी ।
नमस्कृत्वा भूय एवाह कृष्णं सगद्गदं भीतभीतः प्रणम्य ॥ ३५ ॥

Sañjaya uvāca—

Etacchrutvā vacanam Keśavasya kṛtāñjalir-
vepamānaḥ kirīṭī

Namaskṛtvā byūya evāha Kṛṣṇam sa-gadgadam
bhīta-bhītaḥ praṇamya

Sañjaya said—

35. Having heard that speech of Keśava, Kirīṭī (the diademed one, i.e. Arjuna), with joined palms, trembling, prostrated himself, and again addressed Kṛṣṇa in a stammering tone, bowing down, overwhelmed with fear.

Having heard that, aforesaid, *speech of Keśava, Kiriti*[13] (the diademed one), *with joined palms, trembling, prostrated himself,*

11. Arjuna's own mother is the 'maiden'.

12. The account of the war in the *Mahā-bhārata* shows that these four great warriors named by the Lord could be done way with only by special steps adopted by the Lord Himself.

13. A diadem (*kirīṭa* possessing the radiance of the Sun was placed on Arjuna' head by Indra when he fought the Dānavās (vide *M.B. Virāṭa Parva* XLIV-17.) Hence he got the name.

and again addressed Kṛṣṇa in a stammering tone. Owing to the onset of distress in the case of a person overawed by fear, or owing to the welling-up of joy in the case of a person overpowered by affection, the eyes become full of tears and then the throat is choked with phelgm, thereby causing indistinctness and dullness in speech; this is stammering. And, Arjuna spoke in such a tone, *bowina down*, with his mind *over-whelmed with fear* over and over again.

Sañjaya's words have a motive in this context. How? When the unconquerable four, i.e. Droṇa and others, would be slain by Arjuna, Duryodhana also would surely be slain, bereft of support—thinking thus, Dhṛtarāṣṭra, despairing of victory, might bring about peace; and thereby there might be reconciliation between the two (warring) parties. (But) even to this (speech). Dhṛtarāṣṭra did not pay heed, because of the force of what was bound to happen (Destiny).

अर्जुन उवाच—

स्थाने हृषीकेश तव प्रकीर्त्या जगत्प्रहृष्यत्यनुरज्यते च ।
रक्षांसि भीतानि दिशो द्रवन्ति सर्वे नमस्यन्ति च सिद्धसंघाः ॥३६॥

Arjuna uvāca—

Stāhne Hṛṣīkeśa tava prakīrtya jagat-
prahṛṣyatyanurajyate ca
Rakṣāmsi bhītāni diśo dravanti sarve namasyanti
ca siddha-saṁghāḥ

Arjuna said—

36. It is meet, O Hṛṣīkeśa, that the world is delighted and rejoices in Thy praise; Rākṣasas fly in fear to all quarters; and all the hosts of Siddhas bow down (to Thee).

It is meet, it is appropriate, *O Hṛṣīkeśa, that the world is delighted*, gets enraptured, *in Thy praise*, by singing Thy glory

and hearing it. Or, the word 'sthāne' ('it is meet') may be taken as qualifying the objects: the Lord is the proper object of delight and the like, for He is the Self of all and also the Friend of all beings. So also, (the world) *rejoices in*, feels attachment for, Thy praise; and that is also proper; the Lord is the fit object of affection.

Moreover, *Rākṣasas fly in fear*, i.e. overpowered by fear, *to all quarters*;—that also is meet[14]; and *all the hosts*, assemblages, *of Siddhas*, such as Kapila, *bow down* (to Thee);—that is also proper.

The reason for the Lord being the object of delight and the like is now stated:

कस्माच्च ते न नमेरन्महात्मन् गरीयसे ब्रह्मणोऽप्यादिकर्त्रे ।
अनन्त देवेश जगन्निवास त्वमक्षरं सदसत्तत्परं यत् ॥ ३७ ॥

Kasmācca te na nameran-mahātman garīyase
brahmaṇo(a)pyādikartre

Ananta deveśa jagan-nivāsa tvam-akṣaram
sad-asat-tatparam yat

37. And why should they not, O Great-souled One, bow to Thee, Greater (than all else), Primal Cause even of Brahmā, O infinite Being, O Lord of gods, O Abode of the universe? Thou art the Imperishable, the Being and the Non-being, That which is Supreme.

And why, for what reason, *should they not bow* down *to Thee, O Great-souled One*? *Greater* (than all else), for Thou art the *Primal Cause even of Brahmā*, Hiraṇya-garbha;—therefore, why should they not bow down to Thee? Consequently, Thou art the proper object of delight and the like , and of obeisance. *O Infinite Being, O Lord of gods, O Abode of the universe, Thou art the Im-*

14. When the Rākṣasas, who are a part of the universe, are of a different nature from the rest, how can the (whole) universe be said to be delighted and to rejoice? This doubt is thus answered. (Ā)

perishable Being, That which is Supreme, celebrated in the Vedantas (i.e. upaniṣads). What is That? *The Being*, that which is Manifested, *and the Non-being*, the Unmanifested, with respect to which arises the conception of non-existence. These two, "Sat" (Being) and "Asat" (Non-being), from the adjuncts of the Imperishable and so It is spoken of figuratively as the "Sat" and the "Asat". In reality, however, *That which is Supreme*, which transcends the "Sat" and the "Asat", and which the knowers of the Veda speak of as the Imperishable,—That alone Thyself art, and nothing else.

Again, he praises the Lord:

त्वमादिदेवः पुरुषः पुराणस्त्वमस्य विश्वस्य परं निधानम् ।
वेत्तासि वेद्यं च परं च धाम त्वया ततं विश्वमनन्तरूप ॥ ३८ ॥

Tvam ādi-devaḥ puruṣaḥ purānas-tvam-asya viśvasya param nidhānam

Vettāsi vedyam ca param ca dhāma tvayā tatam viśvam-anantarūpa

38. Thou art the Primal God, the Puruṣa Ancient; Thou art the Supreme Refuge of this universe; Thou art the Knower and the Knowable, and the Supreme Abode. By Thee is the universe pervaded, O Thou of boundless Form.

Thou art the Primal God, being the Creator of the universe, *the Puruṣa*, lying in the body, *Ancient*; *Thou* alone *art the Supreme Refuge*, that in which the entire universe is deposited during the great deluge (Mahā-pralaya) and other periods. Moreover, *Thou art the Knower* of the entirety of knowable things, *and the Knowledge*, that which is fit to be known; *and the Supreme Abode*, namely the state of Visnu. *By Thee is the* entire *universe pervaded, O Thou of boundless Form*, He for whose forms there is no limit.

Moreover,

वायुर्यमोऽग्निर्वरुणः शशाङ्कः प्रजापतिस्त्वं प्रपितामहश्च ।
नमो नमस्तेऽस्तु सहस्रकृत्वः पुनश्च भूयोऽपि नमो नमस्ते ॥ ३९ ॥

Vāyur-Yamo(A)gnir-Varuṇaḥ Śaśāṅkaḥ
Prajāpatis-tvam Prapitāmahaśca

Namo namaste(a)stu sahasra-kṛtvaḥ
punaśc abhūyo(a)pi namo namaste

39. Thou art Vāyu, Yama, Agni, Varuna, the Moon, Prajāpati, and the Great-grandfather. Salutation, salutation to Thee, a thousand times, and again and again salutation, salutation to Thee.

Thou art Vāyu, and *Yama, Agni, Varuṇa*, the Lord of the waters, *the Moon* (having a mark, "anka", resembling a hare "Śaśa"), *Prajāpati*, (lord of creation) such as Kaśyapa, *and the Great-grandfather*, the Father of even the Grand-father Brahmā, *Salutation, salutation to Thee, a thousand times, and again and again salutation to Thee.* The expression 'a thousand times' is meant for a count of the abundant, repeated practice of the act of prostration. By saying 'again and again', Arjuna shows this feeling of not having attained complete satisfaction (in saluting the Lord), due to his surpassing faith and devotion.

And,

नमः पुरस्तादथ पृष्ठतस्ते नमोऽस्तु ते सर्वत एव सर्व ।
अनन्तवीर्यामितविक्रमस्त्वं सर्वं समाप्नोषि ततोऽसि सर्वः ॥ ४० ॥

Namaḥ purastād-atha pṛṣṭhatas-te namo(a)stu te
sarvata eva sarva

Ananta-viryāmita-vikramas-tvam sarvam samāpnoşi
tato(a)si sarvaḥ

40. Salutation to Thee before and to Thee behind, salutation to Thee on every side, O All! Thou,

infinite in power and infinite in prowess, pervadest all; wherefore Thou art All.

Salutation to Thee, before, in the eastern direction, *and to Thee, behind* also; *salutation to Thee on every side, O All. who art* present everywhere in all directions! *Thou infinite in power and infinite in prowess*: power is capacity and prowess is courage, the attacking spirit. A man, though powerful (i.e. having the capacity), may not have the daring to hurl weapons etc. against enemies, or he may be slow in attacking; but Thou art infinitely powerful and possess infinite prowess; and Thou *pervadest all*, the entire universe, completely by Thy One Self; *wherefore, Thou art All*, that is to say, without Thee nothing exists.

Because I have been a sinner not knowing Thy greatness therefore,

सखेति मत्वा प्रसभं यदुक्तं हे कृष्ण हे यादव हे सखेति।
अजानता महिमानं तवेदं मया प्रमादात्प्रणयेन वापि॥४१॥

Sakheti matvā prasabham yad-uktam he Kṛṣṇa
he Yādava he sakheti

Ajānatā mahimanam tavedam mayā prāmadāt-
praṇayena vāpi

41. Whatever was rashly said by me, through carelessness or love, addressing Thee as "O[15] Kṛṣṇa, O Yādava, O friend", regarding Thee (merely) as a friend, ignorant of this Thy greatness,

(The sentence is completed in the next verse).

Whatever was rashly, disrespectfully, forcibly, *said by me, through carelessness*, mental distraction, *or love*, familiarity caused, by affection,—through either of these causes, *addressing Thee, as*

15. The 'he!' in the original (for 'O!') signifies an irreverential vocative in the context.

"*O Kṛṣṇa, O Yādava*, and *O friend*", *regarding Thee*, through wrong judgments, merely *as a friend*, a person of the same age, *ignorant of this, Thy greatness*, not knowing of this, the Universal Form of Thyself, Īśvara.

यच्चावहासार्थमसत्कृतोऽसि विहारशय्यासनभोजनेषु ।
एकोऽथवाप्यच्युत तत्समक्षं तत्क्षामये त्वामहमप्रमेयम् ॥ ४२ ॥

Yaccāvahāsārtham-asatkṛto(a)si vihrāa-
Śayyāsana-bhojaneṣu

Eko(a)thavāpyacyuta tat-samakṣam tat-kṣāmaye
tvām-aham-aprameyam

42. In whatever way Thou hast been disrespected, in fun, while walking, reposing, sitting, or at meals, when alone or when directly present, O Acyuta,—I implore Thee, Immeasurable One, to forgive all that.

In whatever way Thou hast been disrespected, insulted, *in fun*, for making merriment,—where? *while walking*, rambling on foot for pleasure, *reposing* in bed, *sitting, or at meals*, taking food,—*when alone*, when Thou wert beyond the range of sight, (Thou hast been treated with disrespect), *or when directly* present *or openly* (Thou hast been disrespected), *O Acyuta,—I implore Thee, Immeasurable One, to forgive all that*, the whole aggregate, of offences.

For,

पितासि लोकस्य चराचरस्य त्वमस्य पूज्यश्च गुरुर्गरीयान् ।
न त्वत्समोऽस्त्यभ्यधिकः कुतोऽन्यो लोकत्रयेऽप्यप्रतिमप्रभाव ॥४३॥

Pitāsi lokasya carācarasya tvam-asya pūjyaśca
gurur-garīyān

Na tvat-samo(a)stabhyadhikaḥ kuto(a)nyo
lokatraye(a)pyapratima-prabhāva

43. Thou art the Father of the World, moving and unmoving; Thou art to be adored by this (World), the Greatest Guru; there exists none who is even equal to Thee, in the thee worlds; whence another superior to Thee, O Thou of power incomparable?

Thou art the Father, the Creator, *of the world*, the aggregate of living beings, *moving and unmoving*; Thou art not merely the Creator of the universe; *Thou art to be adored by this world*, for Thou art *the Greatest Guru*[16]. How art Thou the Greatest Guru?—that is being stated: *there exists none, who is even equal to Thee*, in all the three worlds. There cannot indeed be two Īśvaras (Lords); for, if there be more than one Īśvara, the business of running the universe would become a failure[17]. So, there can be none equal to Thee. *Whence* can there be *another superior to Thee, O Thou of power incomparable?*—Thou, for whose valour, glory, there is no likeness, and to whom belongs the supreme majesty.

Because it is so,

तस्मात्प्रणम्य प्रणिधाय कायं प्रसादये त्वामहमीशमीड्यम् ।
पितेव पुत्रस्य सखेव सख्युः प्रियः प्रियायार्हसि देव सोढुम् ॥४४॥

Tasmāt-praṇamya praṇidhāya kāyam prasādaye tvām-aham-Iśam-īḍyam
Piteva putrasya sakheva sakhyuh priyaḥ priyāyārhasi deva soḍhum

44. So, bowing down, prostrating my body, I crave Thy forgiveness, O Lord adorable! As a father his

16. being the Guru even of other Gurus such as Hiraṇya-garbha. (Ā)

17. If there were more than one Īśvara, each of them would be equally independent; and there being no reason for assuming that they would be of the same mind, they might be of different minds, and when one wishes to create, another might desire to destroy. Thus, the due course of business would suffer violation and the universe would cease to get on in a regulated order as it does now. (Ā)

son, friend a friend, a beloved one his love, even so it is meet Thou shouldst bear with me, O Deva!

So, bowing down in respectful obeisance, *prostrating my body*, laying it very low, *I crave Thy forgiveness*, I implore Thee to be propitious, *O Lord adorable*, Ruler worthy of praise! And, for your part, *as a father* forgiveth all the offences of *his son*, and as *a friend* forgiveth the offences of *a friend*, or as *a beloved one* forgiveth the offences of *his love*, *even so, it is meet, O Deva*, that *Thou* also *shouldst bear with me*, forgive me.

अदृष्टपूर्वं हृषितोऽस्मि दृष्ट्वा भयेन च प्रव्यथितं मनो मे ।
तदेव मे दर्शय देव रूपं प्रसीद देवेश जगन्निवास ॥ ४५ ॥

Adṛṣṭa-pūrvam hṛṣito(a)smi dṛṣṭvā bhayena ca pravyathitam mano me

Tadeva me darsaya deva rūpam prasīda deveśa jagan-nivāsa

45. Overjoyed am I, having seen what was never seen before; yet my mind is distracted with terror. Show me, O Deva, only that (natural) Form; have mercy, O Lord of Devas, O Abode of the universe.

Overjoyed am I, having seen, what was never seen before, this Thy Universal Form, which has not been seen at any time before' by myself or by anyone else. *Yet, my mind, is distracted with terror*. Therefore, *show me, O Deva, only that* (natural *Form*, namely, that of my companion; *have mercy, O Lord of Devas, O Abode of the universe.*

किरीटिनं गदिनं चक्रहस्तमिच्छामि त्वां द्रष्टुमहं तथैव ।
तेनैव रूपेण चतुर्भुजेन सहस्रबाहो भव विश्वमूर्ते ॥ ४६ ॥

Kirīṭinam gadinam cakra-hastam-icchāmi tvām draṣṭum-aham tathaiva

Tenaiva rūpeṇa catur-bhujena sahasra-bāho bhava
viśva-mūrte

46. Diademed, bearing a mace and a discus in the hand(s),—Thee I desire to see like that. Assume that same four-armed Form, O Thou of thousand arms, O Universal Form!

Diademed, wearing a crown, *bearing a mace and a discus in the hand(s), Thee I desire*, implore, *to see like that*, i.e. as Thou wert previously. Wherefore, *assume that same four-armed Form*, that of the Son of Vasudeva. *O Thou of thousand arms*, in Thy present Universal Form, *O Universal Form*. The meaning is: withdrawing the Universal Form, do Thou assume that very Form, as the Son of Vasudeva.

Observing Arjuna terrified, the Lord withdrew the Universal Form, and consoling him with kind words, said:

श्री भगवानुवाच —

मया प्रसन्नेन तवार्जुनेदं रूपं परं दर्शितमात्मयोगात् ।
तेजोमयं विश्वमनन्तमाद्यं यन्मे त्वदन्येन न दृष्टपूर्वम् ॥४७॥

Srī Byagavān-uvāca—

Mayā prasannena tavārjunedam rūpam param
darśitam-ātmayogāt

Tejomayam viśvam-anantam-ādyam yan-me tvad-
anyena na dṛṣṭa-pūrvam

The Blessed Lord said—

47. By Me, being gracious to you, O Arjuna, hath been shown by My own Yogic-power this Form supreme, the resplendent, universal, infinite, Original Form of Mine, which hath not been seen before by any other than yourself.

By Me, being gracious to you,—grace is the disposition to bestow favours—*O Arjuna, hath been shown by My own Yogic-power*, the power of Aiśvarya (the divine faculties of Īśvara), *this Form supreme*, the Universal Form; Viśvarūpa), *the resplendent*, full of splendour, *universal*, comprising all, *infinite*, having no bounds, *Original*, the primeval, *Form of Mine, which hath not been seen before by any* person *other than yourself.*

Having seen the Form of Mine, the Ātman, you have truly become a person who has attained all his ends—on this ground, the Lord praises it (that vision):

न वेदयज्ञाध्ययनैर्न दानैर्न च क्रियाभिर्न तपोभिरुग्रैः ।
एवंरूपः शक्य अहं नृलोके द्रष्टुं त्वदन्येन कुरुप्रवीर ॥४८॥

Na veda-yajñādhyayanair-na dānair-na ca kriyābhir-na tapobhir-ugraiḥ

Evam-rūpaḥ śakya aham nṛloke draṣṭum tvad anyena Kuru-pravīra

48. Neither by the study of the Vedas and of the sacrifices, nor by gifts, nor by rituals, nor by severe austerities, can I be seen in this Form, in the world of men, by any other than yourself, O great hero of the Kurus!

Neither by the study of even *the* four *Vedas* in the prescribed manner, *and* by the study *of the sacrifices*:—since by the mere study of the Vedas the study of sacrifices is also effected, the separate mention of study of sacrifices is for the purpose of indicating that an in-depth knowledge of the sacrifices is implied[18]; so also, *nor by gifts*, (such as that of gold or other valuables) equal to the weight of one's body; *nor by rituals*, such as the Agnihotra, prescribed by

18. Learned elders have held that *adhyayana* (study of the Vedas) ends with learning the text by rote; therefore it does not include an understanding of the meaning and therefore the practical knowledge of the sacrifices. (Ā)

Śruti etc.; *nor* also *by severe austerities*, such as the Cāndrāyaṇa[19], *can I be seen in this Form*, the Universal Form that was manifested, *in the world of men, by any other than yourself*[20], *O great hero of the Kurus*!

मा ते व्यथा मा च विमूढभावो दृष्ट्वा रूपं घोरमीदृङ्ममेदम् ।
व्यपेतभीः प्रीतमनाः पुनस्त्वं तदेव मे रूपमिदं प्रपश्य ॥ ४९ ॥

Mā te vyathā mā ca vimūḍha-bhāvo dṛṣṭvārūpam ghoramīdṛṅg mamedam

Vyapeta-bhīḥ prīta-manāḥ punas-tvam tad-eva me rūpam-idam prapaśya

49. Be not afraid nor bewildered, having beheld this Form of Mine, so terrific. With your fears dispelled, and with gladdened heart, now see again this Form of Mine.

Be not afraid, nor bewildered, let there be no fear in you, nor confusion of mind, *having beheld this Form of Mine, o terrific*, as hath been shown. *With your fears dispelled, and remaining with a gladdened heart, now see again this Form of Mine,* with four arms, holding the conch, the discus and the mace, which you wished to see.

सञ्जय उवाच —

इत्यर्जुनं वासुदेवस्तथोक्त्वा स्वकं रूपं दर्शयामास भूयः ।
आश्वासयामास च भीतमेनं भूत्वा पुनः सौम्यवपुर्महात्मा ॥ ५०

19. A religious observance or expiatory penance wherein the quantity of food taken is regulated by the moon's phases. Beginning with fifteen mouthfuls at the full moon, it is diminished by one mouthful every day during the dark fortnight, till it is reduced to nothing at the new moon, and is increased in like manner during the bright fortnight.

20. that is to say, by any one else, because he has not received My grace. (A)

Sañjaya uvāca—

Ityarjunam Vāsudevas-tathoktvā svakam rūpam darśayāmāsa bhūyaḥ

Āśvāsayāmāsa ca bhītam-enam byūtvā punaḥ saumya-vapur-mahātmā

Sañjaya said—

50. Having thus spoken to Arjuna, Vāsudeva showed His own Form again. And, once more assuming His gentle Form, the Great-souled One pacified him who was terrified.

Having spoken thus, as above[21], ***to Arjuna, Vāsudeva showed His own Form again,*** as born in Vasudeva's family[22]. ***And, once more assuming His gentle Form*** ***of gracious mein***[23], ***the Great-souled One pacified him who was terrified,*** cheered him up.

अर्जुन उवाच —

दृष्ट्वेदं मानुषं रूपं तव सौम्यं जनार्दन ।
इदानीमस्मि संवृत्तः सचेताः प्रकृतिं गतः ॥ ५१ ॥

Arjuna uvāca—

Dṛṣṭvedam mānuṣam rūpam tava saumyam Janārdana

Idanīm-asmi samvṛttaḥ sacetāḥ prakṛtim gataḥ

21. Verses 47 to 49. (Ā)

22. With four arms. (Ā) See *Viṣṇu Purāṇa V*.3. 8; *Bhāgavata X*-iii-9. At birth Śrī Kṛṣṇa had four arms, and immediately thereafter He assumed the two armed form.

23. This refers to the usual human form with two hands.

Arjuna said—

51. Having seen this, Thy gentle human Form, O Janārdana, I have now become composed in mind and have recovered myself.

Having seen this, Thy gentle human Form, that of my friend, and propitious in countenance, *O Janārdana, I have now become composed in mind*, my mind has become soothed and pellucid; *and* I *have recovered myself*,, returned to my own nature.

श्री भगवानुवाच —

सुदुर्दर्शमिदं रूपं दृष्ट्वानसि यन्मम ।
देवा अप्यस्य रूपस्य नित्यं दर्शनकाङ्क्षिणः ॥ ५२ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Su-dur-darśam-idam rūpam dṛṣṭavān asi yan-mama
Devā apyasya rūpasya nityam darśana-kamkṣiṇaḥ

The Blessed Lord said—

52. Very hard indeed it is to see this Form of Mine, which you have seen; even the Devas ever long to behold this Form.

Very hard indeed it is to see this Form of Mine which you have seen: it can be seen only with very great difficulty; *even the Devas, ever*, at all times, *long to behold this Form* of Mine. The implication is: though always desirous of seeing It, they have neither seen It as you have done, nor are they ever going to see it.

Why so?

नाहं वेदैर्न तपसा न दानेन न चेज्यया ।
शक्य एवंविधो द्रष्टुं दृष्टवानसि मां यथा ॥ ५३ ॥

Nāham vedair-na tapasā na dānena na cejyayā
Śakya evam-vidho draṣṭum dṛṣṭavānasi mām yathā

53. Neither by Vedas, nor by austerity, nor by gifts, nor by sacrifice, can I be seen in this Form, as you have seen Me.

Neither by the four *Vedas*, the Ṛk, the Yajus, the Sāma, and the Atharva, *nor by* severe *austerity*, such as the Cāndrāyaṇa, *nor by gifts* of cows, land, gold, and the like, *nor by sacrifice* or worship, *can I be sce in this Form,* in the manner manifested by Me, and *as you have seen Me.*

" How then canst Thou be seen?''

"Listen'':

भक्त्या त्वनन्यया शक्य अहमेवंविधोऽर्जुन ।
ज्ञातुं द्रष्टुं च तत्त्वेन प्रवेष्टुं ज परन्तप ॥५४॥

Bhaktyā tvananyayā śakya aham-evam-vidho (a) rjuna

Jñātum draṣṭum ca tattvena praveṣṭum ca parantapa

54. But by devotion unique, I of this Form may be known, O Arjuna, and seen in reality, and also entered into, O scorcher of foes!

But by devotion—of what characteristic? that is being told: *unique*, undistracted: undistracted devotion is that which never occupies itself with anything except the Lord and by reason of which nothing except Vāsudeva is comprehended by everyone of the senses; with such devotion, *I of this Form,* the Universal Form, *may bc known* through the Śāstras (Scripture), *O Arjuna*! Not only can I be known through Scripture, but I can also be *seen in reality*, realised truly, directly, personally, *and also entered into*, reaching to the state of liberation, *O scorcher of foes*!

Now, the essence of the teaching of the whole *Gītā-Śāstra*, which conduces to Supreme Felicity is summed up and laid down as the one to be followed (by all):

मत्कर्मकृन्मत्परमो मद्भक्तः सङ्गवर्जितः ।
निर्वैरः सर्वभूतेषु यः स मामेति पाण्डव ॥ ५५ ॥

Mat-karmakṛn-mat-paramo mad-bhaktaḥ saṇga-varjitaḥ
Nir-vairaḥ sarva-bhūteṣu yaḥ sa mām eti Pāṇḍava

55. He who does work for Me, and has Me for his goal, is devoted to Me, is free from attachment, and is without hatred towards all creatures,—he bcomes to Me, O Pāṇḍava!

He who does work for Me, for My sake, *and has Me for his goal*; a servant does work for his master, but he does not look upon that master as the highest goal to be reached by him after death; but this person who does work for Me regards Me alone as the supreme goal; I am his supreme goal; so also, he *is devoted to Me*, he serves (resorts to) Me alone in all manner of ways, with his whole heart and soul; he *is free from attachment*, he has no attachment or love for wealth, progeny, friends, wife, or kinsmen; *and* he *is without hatred towards all creatures*, he bears no enmity towards any of the creatures, even towards those who might have caused extreme injury to him; *he* who is such a devotee of Mine, *comes to Me*; I Myself being his supreme goal, nothing else can ever be the destination he will reach[24]. This is the desired teaching offered by Me to you. *O Pāṇḍava*!

24. The fruit of meditation on the Universal Form, by such a devotee, is *krama-mukti*, (liberation step by step); and he will get final release after reaching the Lord. (Ā)

इति श्रीमहाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्यां
भीष्मपर्वणि श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु
ब्रह्मविद्यायां योगशास्त्रे श्रीकृष्णार्जुन-
संवादे विश्वरूपदर्शनं नाम
एकादशोऽध्यायः ॥

Iti Śrī-Mahābhārate Śata-sāhasryām saṁhitāyām Vaiyāsikyām Bhīṣma-Parvaṇi Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītāsūpaniṣatsu Brahma-vidyāyām yoga-śāstre Śrī Kṛṣṇārjuna-Samvāde 'Viśvarūpa-darśanam' nāma ekādaśo(a)dhyayāh.

Thus the eleventh chapter entitled 'Vision of the Universal Form' in the Upaniṣads known as 'The Celebrated Songs of the Lord' expounding the Knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna—embodied in the Bhiṣma-Parva of Śrī Mahābhārata, the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyāsa.

॥ द्वादशोऽध्यायः ॥

(भक्तियोगः)

DVĀDAŚO(A)DHYAYAḤ

(*BHAKTI–YOGAḤ*)

CHAPTER - XII

(WAY OF DEVOTION)

(Arjuna asks:) "In the chapters commencing from the second and ending with that describing the Divine Glory (Chap. X), the meditation of the Supreme Self (*Parmātman*), the Imperishable (*Akṣara*) Brahman, devoid of all attributes, has been taught. (As distinguished from this teaching,) the worship of Thyself, the Lord (Īśvara) associated with the condition (*upādhi*) of Sattva, Who has the divine power of effecting all evolutionary process[1] and the capacity to know everything, has also been taught here and there. And in the Chapter (XI) treating of the Universal Form, Thy Primal Form as Īśvara, the Universal Form manifested as the entire universe, has been disclosed by Thee for the very purpose of Thy worship; and having disclosed that Form, Thou hast taught me to do work for Thy sake and so on (XI.55). Therefore, desirous of kowing which of these two alternatives is the better, I question Thee (as follows)":

अर्जुन उवाच —

एवं सततयुक्ता ये भक्तास्त्वां पर्युपासते ।
ये चाप्यक्षरमव्यक्तं तेषां के योगवित्तमाः ॥ १ ॥

Arjuna uvāca—

Evam satata-yuktā ye bhaktās-tvām paryupāsate
Ye cāpyakṣaram-avyaktam teṣām ke yogāvit-tamāḥ

1. (*Sarva-yoga*) the accomplishment of the processes known as the birth, stay, dissolution, appearance, and restraint, of the entire universe. (Ā)

Arjuna said—

1. Of these—those devotees who, ever steadfast, thus worship Thee[2], and those also who (meditate on) the Imperishable, the Unmanifested—which are the better-versed in Yoga.

Of these two classes (of worshippers)—*those devotees who eversteadfast,* uninterruptedly engaging themselves in doing the work of the Lord and in other matters as taught, with their mind concentrated, *thus,*—referring to what was stated in the immediately preceding verse: "He who does work for Me" and so on. (XI.55)—*worship Thee,* things of Thee in the Universal Form as was manifested, resorting to nothing else as their refuge; *and those also,* others, *who,* having given up all desires and renouncing all actions, *meditate on* Brahman, characterised as *the Imperishable, the Unmanifested,* incomprehensible to the senses, because of its being devoid of all upadhis (conditions); indeed, in common usage, that which is comprehended by the senses is said to be manifest, as the meaning of the root 'añj' (to make clear) denotes; but this, the Imperishable, is the opposite; and also as designated by other attributes[3] to be mentioned hereafter (XII-3)—*which are the better-versed in yoga*?: Which are knowers of Yoga in a superior degree?

श्री भगवानुवाच —

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

The Blessed Lord said—

Those who worship the Imperishable, those seers of Truth who have given up all desires, let them remain; what has to be said of them, We shall say later (Verses 3 to 5 But, as regards the others:

2. i.e. Isvara, the Personal God with attributes, of the Universal Form, and therefore, with cosmic functions, as contrasted with "the Imperishable, the unmanifested" which is the attributeless, a-cosmic, Impersonal Absolute (Brahman, Ātman).

3. These so-called attributes like "Indefinable", "unthinkable" etc. also only point to the attribute-less-ness of the absolute.

मय्यावेश्य मनो ये मां नित्ययुक्ता उपासते ।
श्रद्धया परयोपेतास्ते मे युक्ततमा मताः ॥ २ ॥

Mayyāveśya mano ye mām nityayuktā upāsate
Śraddhayā parayopetas-te fme yukta-tamā matāḥ

2. Those who, fixing their mind on Me, worship Me, ever steadfast, endowed with supreme faith, they in My opinion are the best in Yoga.

Those devotees *who, fixing their mind on Me*, concentrating their thought on Me, the Supreme Lord (Parameśvara) in the Universal Form, *worship Me*, the Supreme Lord of all masters of Yoga, the All-knowing, (Me) of vision devoid of purblindness (darkness) ("timira") in the form of the troubles (kleśas), attachment and the rest[4], *ever steadfast* in the manner stated in the concluding verse of the preceding Chapter, *endowed with supreme faith, they in My opinion are*, them I consider as, *the best in Yoga.* Without interruption, indeed, do they pass day and night with their mind devoted to Me; wherefore, it is meet to speak of them as the best of yogins.

Are not the others, then, the best of yogins?—Not so; just hear what has to be said about them:

ये त्वक्षरमनिर्देश्यमव्यक्तं पर्युपासते ।
सर्वत्रगमचिन्त्यं च कूटस्थमचलं ध्रुवम् ॥ ३ ॥

Ye tvakṣaram-anirdeśyam-avyaktam paryupāsate
Sarvatragam-acintyam ca kūṭastham-acalam dhruvam

3. But, those, who contemplate the Imperishable, the Indefinable, the Unmanifested, the Omnipresent, and the Unthinkable, the Unchangeable, the Immovable, the Eternal,

4. Vide note 12, Chapter VIII.

(The sentence is completed in the next verse)

But, those, who contemplate, meditate everywhere and in every way, *the Imperishable, the Indefinable,* that which baffles definition, being outside the range of speech by reason of its being *the Unmanifested,* that which cannot be made manifest by any of the means of obtaining knowledge[5].

Contemplation (upāsana) consists in approaching the object of worship by way of meditating on it, in accordance with the Teaching (Sāstra), and dwelling steadily for a long time in the current of one single thought as continuous as a line of flowing oil: this is said to be upāsana.

The Lord proceeds to set out the attributes of the Imperishable:—*the Omnipresent,* all-pervasive, like the ākāśa (space) *and the Unthinkable,* by reason of its being Un-manifested. Only that which is within the range of an instrument of proof (or a sense-organ) becomes an object for contemplation by the mind; and because It is not so, the Imperishable is unthinkable. (It is also) the *Unchangeable* (kūṭastha). 'Kūṭa' means a thing which is seemingly good, but is evil within, as is familiar in worldly usage in such words as 'kūṭa-rūpa' (deceptive form) and 'kūṭasākṣya' (false evidence); accordingly, it signifies here the seed of all samsāra, including nescience (avidyā) and the rest, consisting of evil within, and well-known as that referred to by various terms as 'Māyā', 'Avyākṛta', in such texts as the following:

'Know Prakṛti to be Māyā and the Supreme Lord (Maheśvara) to be the Mayin (the Lord of Māyā),. (*Śv.*IV.10);

'My Māyā is difficult to cross over' (VII.14).

Seated in that Kūṭa (i.e. Māyā) as presiding over it (as the Witness), It is Kūṭastha.

Or, Kūṭastha means 'staying as a heap'. Hence, it is also *the 'Immovable'*; and because immovable, therefore It is *the Eternal constant.*

5. *Pramāṇas* (instruments of valid knowledge). They are: *pratyakṣa* (direct perception), *anumāna* (inference), *śābda* (verbal (Vedic) testimony), *upamāna* (comparison), *arthāpatti* (persumption) and *abhāva* (absence; also referred to as *anupalabdhi,* non-cognition).

संनियम्येन्द्रियग्रामं सर्वत्र समबुद्धयः ।
ते प्राप्नुवन्ति मामेव सर्वभूतहिते रताः ॥ ४ ॥

Saṁniyaṁyendriya-grāmam sarvatra sama-buddhayaḥ
Te prāpnuvanti mām-eva sarva-bhūta-hite ratāḥ

4. having subdued all the senses, always equanimous, intent on the welfare of all beings, verily they reach Myself.

having well-*subdued*, restrained, *all the senses*, the multitude of the senses; *always*, at all times, *equanimous*, having the same feeling (of indifference) on meeting with the desirable and the undesirable; *intent on the welfare of all beings*; *they*, those who are of this sort, *verily reach Myself*; with respect to them, it needs no saying that they reach Me; for it has been said 'but the Wise-man I regard as My very Self' (VII.18). Neither is it necessary to speak of these sages who are one with the Lord (i.e. the Lord Himself) that they are the best of yogins or that they are not so.

But,

क्लेशोऽधिकतरस्तेषामव्यक्तासक्तचेतसाम् ।
अव्यक्ता हि गतिर्दुःखं देहवद्भिरवाप्यते ॥ ॥ ५ ॥

Kleśo(a)dhika-taras-teṣām-avyaktāsakta cetasām
Avyaktā hi gatir-duḥkham dehavadbhir-avāpyate

5. Greater is the trouble of those whose mind is set on the Unmanifested; for the Goal, the Un—manifested, is very hard for the embodied to reach.

Even though the trouble of those who devote themselves, solely to doing work for Me, etc. (XI.55) is great, *greater* still *is the trouble of those* who identify themselves with the Imperishable and perceive the Supreme Truth—, i.e., *of those whose mind is set on the Unmanifested, for, the Goal, the Unmanifested,* i.e. the imperishable, *is*

very hard for the embodied, those who have attachment for the body, *to reach*; therefore[6], their trouble is greater.

What the mode of living of those who contemplate on the Imperishable is, that we shall describe later on (verses 13 to 20).

ये तु सर्वाणि कर्माणि मयि संन्यस्य मत्पराः ।
अनन्येनैव योगेन मां ध्यायन्त उपासते ॥ ६ ॥

Ye tu sarvāṇi karmāṇi mayi saṁnyasya mat-parāḥ
Ananyenaiva yogena mām dhyāyanta upāsate

6. But those who worship Me, resigning all actions in Me, regarding Me as the Supreme Goal, meditating on Me with single-minded *Yoga,*—

(The sentence is completed in the next verse.)

But those who worship Me, resigning all actions in Me, the Īśvara (Lord), *regarding Me as the Supreme Goal, meditating on* contemplating, *Me with single-minded Yoga*, i.e. samadhi, steadfastness of mind, having no other object (of worship) to hold on to except the Self, the Lord in the Universal Form—

What about them?

तेषामहं समुद्धर्ता मृत्युसंसारसागरात् ।
भवामि नचिरात्पार्थ मय्यावेशित चेतसाम् ॥ ७ ॥

Teṣām-aham samuddhartā mṛtyu-saṁsāra-sāgarāt
Bhavāmi nacirāt-Pārtha mayyāveśita cetasām

7. for them, whose mind is set on Me, I become ere long, O Pārtha, the deliverer out of the ocean of mortal *saṁsāra*.

for them, those who are exclusively engaged in contemplating Me, *whose mind is set on Me,* whose thought is fixed on Me in the

6. Since they have to abandon the attachment to the body. (Ā)

Universal Form, *I*, the Lord (Īśvara), *become, ere long*, very quickly, *O Pārtha, the deliverer*[7]—From what? (From) *out of the ocean of mortal saṁsāra*: saṁsāra (transmigratory existence) is associated with death (mṛtyu); and it is ocean-like, because it is very hard to cross.

Because it is thus, therefore—

मय्येव मन आधत्स्व मयि बुद्धिं निवेशय ।
निवसिष्यसि मय्येव अत ऊर्ध्वं न संशयः ॥ ८ ॥

Mayyeva mana ādhatsva mayi buddhim niveśaya
Nivasiṣyasi mayyeva ata ūrdhvam na saṁśayaḥ

8. Fix your mind on Me alone; place your intellect in Me; you shall no doubt live in Me alone hereafter

Fix your mind (manas), characterised by thinking and indecision, *on Me alone*, the Lord in the Universal Form; *place your intellect* (*buddhi*), which resolves and determines, *in Me alone*;—what then will happen to you, hear: *you shall hereafter*, after the casting off of the body, *live in Me alone*, without fail abide in Me as Myself: about this there need be *no doubt*.

अथ चित्तं समाधातुं न शक्नोषि मयि स्थिरम् ।
अभ्यासयोगेन ततो मामिच्छाप्तुं धनञ्जय ॥ ९ ॥

Atha cittam samādhātum na śaknoṣi mayi sthiram
Abhyāsa-yogena tato mām-icchāptum Dhanañjaya

9. If you are unable to fix your mind steadily on Me, then by *Abhyāsa-Yoga* do you seek to reach Me, O Dhanañjaya.

If you are unable to fix your mind steadily on Me, permanently, in the manner I have stated, *then, by Abhyāsa-yoga*: "abhyāsa",

7. by giving them the support of Knowledge. ,Ā)

practice, consists in repeatedly withdrawing the mind from everywhere (it roves about) and fixing it on one particular object; and "Abhyāsa-Yoga" means "samādhāna)", steadfastness of mind acquired by such practice[8]. By such Abhyāsa-Yoga, *do you seek*, earnestly desire, *to reach Me* in the Universal Form, *O Dhanañjaya.*

अभ्यासेऽप्यसमर्थोऽसि मत्कर्मपरमो भव ।
मदर्थमपि कर्माणि कुर्वन्सिद्धिमवाप्स्यसि ॥ १० ॥

Abhyase(a)pyasamartho(a)si mat-karma-paramo bhava
Madartham-api karmāṇi kurvan-siddhim-avāpsyasi

10. If you are not capable of *Abhyāsa* even, be you intent on (doing) actions for My sake. Even by doing actions for My sake, you shall attain perfection.

If you are not capable of Abhyāsa even, unable to practise Abhyāsa-Yoga, then, *be you intent on* doing, *actions for My sake. Even by* merely *doing actions for My sake,* without practising Abhyāsa-Yoga, *you shall attain perfection,* through attainment (successively) of purity of mind (*sattva-śuddhi*), steadfastness (yoga), and Knowledge (jñāna).

अथैतदप्यशक्तोऽसि कर्तुं मद्योगमाश्रितः ।
सर्वकर्मफलत्यागं ततः कुरु यतात्मवान् ॥ ११ ॥

Athaitadapyaśakto(a)si kartum mad-yogam-āśritaḥ
Sarva-karma-phala-tyāgam tataḥ kuru yatātmavān

11. If you are unable to do even this, then, taking refuge in Me, do you abandon the fruit of all action, self-controlled.

8. Fixing the mind on a single object such as a gross image should first be practised (*abhyāsa*); then the mind should be rendered one-pointed, inwardly, on the Universal Form (*samādhāna*). (Ā) Cp. Chapter VI-35. It may be noted that that Chapter is entitled *Abhyāsa-Yoga* also.

If, again, *you are unable to do even this*, namely, being intent on doing actions for My sake, *then, taking refuge in Me*, i.e. renouncing in Me all the actions you engage in, and performing them in that attitude, and then, *do you abandon the fruit of all* those *actions, self-controlled*, with your mind subdued.

Now, the Lord extols the abandoning of the fruits of all actions:

श्रेयो हि ज्ञानमभ्यासाज्ज्ञानाद्ध्यानं विशिष्यते।
ध्यानात्कर्मफलत्यागस्त्यागाच्छान्तिरनन्तरम् ॥ १२ ॥

Śreyo hi jñānam-abhyāsaj-jñānād-dhyānam viśiṣyate

Dhyānāt-karma-phala-tyāgas-tyāgācchāntir-anantaram

12. Better indeed is knowledge than *Abhyāsa*; meditation is more esteemed than knowledge; (more exteemed) than meditation is the renunciation of the fruit of actions; on renouncing, peace immediately follows.

Better indeed, more estimable, *is knowledge*,—than what?—*than Abhyāsa*, practice not accompanied with knowledge; *than* such *knowledge, meditation* accompanied with knowledge *is more esteemed*; better even *than meditation* with knowledge *is the renunciation of the fruit of actions*; *on renouncing* the fruit of actions thus, with the qualification afore-mentioned[9], *peace*, the cessation of saṁsāra with its cause, *immediately follows*: there is no question of any lapse of time.

In the case of the not-wise person engaged in action, renunciation of the fruit of all action has been taught as the means to Bliss, (only) when he is not capable of taking to the means taught previsously, but not at first; wherefore, renunication of the fruit of

9. i.e. self-control (vide. XII). (A)

all action is being merely extolled by the statements, "better indeed is knowledge than *Abhyāsa*" and so on, one after another, in ascending order of superiority; for, it (renunciation of the fruit of all action) is taught for adoption only when one is unable to follow the mature paths previously taught.

On what ground of similarity is the extolment?

(Reply): In the text "When all (desires dwelling in the heart) vanish" (*Ka.* VI.14), it is stated that immortality results on the disappearance of all desires; and this is well-known. By all desires is meant the fruits of all actions enjoined in *Śruti* and *Smṛti*; and on, the renunciation of all desires, peace immediately comes to the man of Wisdom devoted to the path of Knowledge. In the renunciation of the fruit of actions by the not-wise person, there is the similarity to renunciation of all desires; and because of this similarity, (mere) abandonment of the fruits of all actions is extolled, with a view to creating a desire (to follow that course). It is just as by saying, "Agastya, a brāhmaṇa, drank the ocean',, the brāhmaṇas, even of the present day, are adulated (merely) because they also happen to be brāhmaṇas. Thus, it has been taught thet Karma-Yoga, by renunciation of the fruit of action, is a means to Supreme Felicity (Bliss).

And here, *Yoga* consisting in deep concentration of the mind on the Lord in the Universal Form, as also the performance of work for the sake of the Lord, etc., have been prescribed, resting on the (supposition of a) distinction between Atman and Īśvara. By the words, 'If you are unable to do even this' (XII.11), the Lord indicates that Karma-yoga pertains to the domain of ignorance (*ajñāna*) and thereby points out that it is not appropriate for the seer of non-difference, who contemplates on the Imperishable (*Akṣara*). In like manner, the Lord points out the impossibility of contemplation on the Imperishable for a Karma-yogin. Having, in the words, 'Verily, they reach Myself' (XII-4), declared that in the matter of attaining liberation (*kaivalya*) the worshippers of the *Akṣara* are self-dependent (not dependent), the Lord shows that the others are dependent on another, namely Īsvara (the Lord), in the words, 'For them, I become the deliverer' (XII.7). Had they (the Karma-yogins) been deemed by the Lord to be His very Self .one with Himself), then it would have been inelegant

to speak of delivering them, they being the *Aksara* Itself by reason of their realisation of identity. Moreover, the Lord, who is the supreme well-wisher of Arjuna, prescribes for him only Karma-yoga (IV.15), which is based on the idea of distinction and is dissociated from Plenary Knowledge[10]. Nor would one, who knows himself through the proper means of Right Knowledge to be the Lord Himself, become a secondary element with respect to anything[11]; for such a position is mutually contradictory. Accordingly, the Lord proceeds to state the multitude of attributes, such as 'hating no creature' (XII-13), which are the direct means to immortality, with reference to the worshippers of the Akṣara, who are devoted to Right Knowledge, the *saṁnyāsins* who have renounced all desires[12]:

अद्वेष्टा सर्वभूतानां मैत्रः करुण एव च ।
निर्ममो निरहङ्कारः समदुःखसुखः क्षमी ॥ १३ ॥

Adveṣṭā sarva-bhūtānām maitraḥ karuṇa eva ca
Nir-mamo nir-ahaṁkaraḥ sama-duḥkha-sukhaḥ kṣamī

13. He who has no hatred to all (any) creatures, and is friendly and compassionate (towards all), who is free from attachment and egoism, even-minded in pain and pleasure, and forbearing;

(The sentence is completed in the next verse.)

He who has no hatred to all creatures, hates nothing whatever, even that which causes him pain, since he indeed sees all beings as himself; *and is friendly*, behaves with friendliness, *and compassionate*, (is) full of compassion, sympathy towards the distressed; that is to say, offering protection from fear to all beings,

10. This is another reason why *Karma-yoga* and contemplation of *Akṣara* cannot be combined in one and the same person simultaneously. (Ā)

11. as agent in an action. (Ā)

12. Because, the attributes being mentioned cannot all of them apply to those who are without Self-Knowledge, namely, to the *karmayogins*. However such of the attributes as are not incompatible apply to all. (Ā)

namely a samnyāsin; *who is free from attachment*, the idea of mineness, *and egoism*, the idea of I-ness; (who is) *even-minded in pain and pleasure*: in whom pain and pleasure equally fail to produce hatred and liking (respectively); *and* (who is) *forbearing*, remains unchanged (unattached) when abused or beaten.

सन्तुष्टः सततं योगी यतात्मा दृढनिश्चयः।
मय्यर्पितमनोबुद्धिर्यो मद्भक्तः स मे प्रियः ॥ १४ ॥

Santuṣṭaḥ satatam yogī yatātmā dṛḍha-niścayaḥ
Mayyarpita-mano-buddhir-yo mad-bhaktaḥ sa me priyaḥ

14. ever content, and steady in meditation, self-controlled, possessed of firm conviction, with mind and intellect fixed on Me—he, who is thus devoted to Me, is dear to Me.

ever content, always with the feeling of having had enough, whether he obtains or not the means for the sustenance of the body, as well as being contented whether he obtains or is deprived of any good thing; *and steady in meditation*, with mind concentrated; *self-controlled*, of restrained nature[13]; *possessed of firm conviction*, concerning the true nature of the Self; *with* (his) *mind*, characterised by thinking *and* (his) *intellect* (buddhi) which determines, *fixed on Me*, directed to Me alone: such is the saṁnyāsin; *he, who is thus devoted to Me, is dear to me.* Here is amplified the truth which was indicated in the seventh chapter (verse 17), "Supremely dear am I to the wise, and he is dear to Me."

यस्मान्नोद्विजते लोको लोकान्नोद्विजते च यः।
हर्षामर्षभयोद्वेगैर्मुक्तो यः स च मे प्रियः ॥ १५ ॥

Yasmān-nodvijate loko lokān-nodvijate ca yaḥ
Harṣāmarṣa-bhayodvegair-mukto yaḥ sa ca me priyaḥ

13. *svabhāvā* (nature): here refers to the body and the senses. (Ā)

15. He by whom the world is not afflicted, and who is not afflicted by the world; who is free from joy, envy, fear, and anxiety;—he is dear to Me.

He, the saṁnyāsin, *by whom the world is not afflicted*, tormented or agitated, *and who*, likewise *is not afflicted by the world*; *who is free from joy*, the elation of mind (antaḥ-karaṇa) on obtaining a cherished object, exhibited by hairs standing on end, tears falling, and so on, *envy*, intolerance (of another's superiority), *fear, and anxiety;—he is dear to Me.*

अनपेक्षः शुचिर्दक्ष उदासीनो गतव्यथः ।
सर्वारम्भपरित्यागी यो मद्भक्तः स मे प्रियः ॥ १६ ॥

Anapekṣaḥ śucir-dakṣa udāsīno gata-vyathaḥ
Sarvārambha-parityāgī yo mad-bhaktaḥ sa me priyaḥ

16. He, who is free from wants, who is pure, competent, unconcerned, pain-departed, (and) renouncing all undertakings—he who is (thus) devoted to Me is dear to Me.

He who is free from wants, who is indifferent to the needs of the body, the senses, the sense-objects, and their mutual connections, etc.; *who is pure*, is possessed of both external and internal purity[14], *competent*, able to decide rightly and immediately in matters demanding prompt attention; *unconcerned*, not taking the side of anybody, a friend or the like; such is the samnyāsin; *pain-departed*, unafraid[15]; *renouncing all undertakings*, habituated to giving up all actions, which are prompted by desire for enjoyment of fruits whether of this world or of the next;—*he who is* (thus) *devoted to Me is dear to Me.*

Moreover,

14. See XIII.7 Com. and XVI. 3 Com.

15. *Vyatha* means both pain and fear.

यो न हृष्यति न द्वेष्टि न शोचति न काङ्क्षति ।
शुभाशुभपरित्यागी भक्तिमान्यः स मे प्रियः ॥ १७ ॥

Yo na hṛṣyati na dveṣṭi na śocati na kāṅgkṣati
Śubhāśubha-parityāgī bhaktimān-yaḥ sa me priyaḥ

17. He who neither rejoices nor hates, nor grieves, nor desires, renouncing good and evil,—he who is full of devotion is dear to Me.

He who neither rejoices on obtaining what is desirable; *nor hates*, frets at reciving what is not desirable; *nor grieves at parting* with a beloved object; *nor desires* what has not been obtained; habituated to *renouncing good and evil* actions;—*he who is full of devotion is dear to Me.*

समः शत्रौ च मित्रे च तथा मानापमानयोः ।
शीतोष्ण सुखदुःखेषु समः सङ्गविवर्जितः ॥ १८ ॥

Samaḥ śatrau ca mitre c. tathā mānāpamānayoḥ
Śitoṣṇa sukha-duhkheṣu samaḥ saṁga-vivarjitaḥ

18. He who is the same to foe and friend, and also in honour and dishonour; the same in cold and heat, in pleasure and pain; free from attachment;

(The sentence is completed in the next verse.)

He who is the same to foe and friend, and also in honour and dishonour, when respected and when insulted; *the same in cold and heat*; *in pleasure and pain*; *free from attachment* for objects of any kind;

And also,

तुल्यनिन्दास्तुतिर्मौनी सन्तुष्टो येन केनचित् ।
अनिकेतः स्थिरमतिर्भक्तिमान्मे प्रियो नरः ॥ १९ ॥

Tulya-nindā-stutir-maunī santuṣṭo yena kenacit
Aniketaḥ sthiramatir-bhaktimān-me priyo naraḥ

19. to whom censure and praise are equal; who is silent, content with anything; homeless; steady-minded; full of devotion;—that man is dear to Me.

to whom censure and praise are equal; *who is silent*, of controlled speech; *content with anything*, by way of the bare means of sustenance;—as has been said:

"Who is clad with anything, who is fed on any food, who lies down anywhere, him the gods call a brāhmaṇa (*M.B.—Ś*245-12);

And also *homeless*, having no fixed resting place, 'house-less' ("anāgārah") as has been stated in another smṛti; *steady-minded*, with his thought fixed steadily on the Supreme Reality; *full of devotion*;—*that man is dear to Me.*

The collection of special attributes (virtues) of saṁnyāsins—those who contemplate on the Imperishable (*Akṣara*), having given up all desires and devoting themselves to the kowledge of the Supreme Reality—which commenced with "he who has no hatred to all creatures" (XII.13) is being concluded:

ये तु धर्म्यामृतमिदं यथोक्तं पर्युपासते ।
श्रद्दधाना मत्परमा भक्तास्तेऽतीव मे प्रियाः ॥ २० ॥

Ye tu dharmyāmṛtam-idam yathoktam paryupāsate
Śraddhadhānā mat-paramā bhaktās-te(a)tīva me priyāḥ

20. They indeed who follow this, the Dharmic Immortal, as described above, endued with faith, regarding Me as the Supreme, and evoted,—they are exceedingly dear to Me.

They indeed, the samnyāsins, *who follow this, the Dhārmic Immortal*: Dhārmic, because it is not deviating from Dharma, and Immortal, because it leads to Immortality; *as described above*, in the passage beginning with "he who has no hatred to all creatures'' (XII-13), *endued with faith, regarding Me as the Supreme*, holding Me, the Imperishable Self, as the unsurpassed goal for them, *and devoted to Me*, resorting to the highest devotion, consisting in the Knowledge of the Supreme Reality,—*they are exceedingly dear to Me.*

That which was implied in the statement, 'supremely dear am I to the wise' (VII-17) has been explained at length and concluded here in the words, 'they are exceedingly dear to Me'. The import of the sentence is: since by following this Immortal Dharma, as described above, one becomes exceedingly dear to Me, Bhagavān Viṣṇu, the Supreme Lord, therefore this Immortal Dharma should be followed assiduously by the seeker of liberation, desirous of attaining to the Supreme Abode, dear to Viṣṇu.

इति श्रीमहाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्यां
भीष्मपर्वणि श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु
ब्रह्मविद्यायां योगशास्त्रे श्रीकृष्णार्जुन-
संवादे भक्तियोगो नाम
द्वादशोऽध्यायः ॥

Iti Śrī Mahābhārate śata-sāhasryām saṁhitāyām
Vaiyāsikyām Bhīṣma-Parvaṇi Śrīmad-Byagavad-
Gītāsūpaniṣatsu Brahma-vidyāyām yoga-śāstre
Śrī Kṛṣṇārjuna-samvāde Bhakti-yogo nāma
dvādaśo(a)dhyāyaḥ

Thus the twelfth chapter entitled 'The Way of Devotion' in the Upaniṣads known as 'The celebrated Songs of the Lord' expounding the Knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between

Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna—embodied in the Bhīṣma-Parva of Śrī Mahābhārata, the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyāsa.

॥ त्रयोदशोऽध्यायः ॥
(प्रकृतिपुरुषविवेक योगः)

TRAYODAŚO(A)DHYAYAḤ

PRAKṚTI–PURUṢA–VIVEKA–YOGAḤ

CHAPTER - XIII

(WAY OF DISCRIMINATING MATTER AND SPIRIT)

In the seventh chapter were indicated two *Prakrtis* (Forms) of the Lord (Īśvara)[1]: one composed of the three *guṇas* and divided eightfold, the inferior (*Prakṛti*) by reason of its being the cause of *saṁsāra*; and the other, the superior (*Prakṛti*), the principle of Self-Consciousness, namely the *Kṣetranjña*, the Knower of the Kṣetra (Matter i.e. body), being essentially one with the Lord. And, (it was stated that) possessed of these two *Prakṛtis* the Lord becomes the cause of the origin, sustenance and dissolution of the universe (VII-4 to 6). Now , this (present) chapter on *Kṣetra* is commenced with a view, by way of describing the two *Prakṛtis* designated as *kṣetra* and *Kṣetrajña*, to determining the true nature of Īśvara, the possessor of the two *Prakṛtis*.

Besides, in the immediately preceding chapter, commencing from, "He who has no hatred to all creatures" (verse.13) and upto the end of the chapter, the state of saṁnyāsins, the knowers of Truth, that is to say, how they conduct themselves in life, has been described. The question arises: possessed of what (sort of) knowledge of the Truth do they become dear to the Lord, by following the course of conduct stated? For the purpose of setting this out also, this chapter is begun.

Pṛakrti, which is composed of the three *guṇas*, transforms itself into all forms, the *kārya* (bodies), the *karaṇa* (senses) and the

1. By referring to them as forms of the Lord, their self-dependence (i.e. existence apart from the Lord) is negated. (Ā)

viṣaya (sense-objects), and is combined in the form of the body, senses, etc., for the purpose of subserving the end of *Puruṣa* (the soul), namely enjoyment and liberation. Such combination is this body; and referring to it,

श्री भगवानुवाच —
इदं शरीरं कौन्तेय क्षेत्रमित्यभिधीयते ।
एतद्यो वेत्ति तं प्राहुः क्षेत्रज्ञ इति तद्विदः ॥ १ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Idam śarīram Kaunteya kṣetram-ityabhīdhiyate
Etad-yo vetti tam prāhuḥ Kṣetrajña iti tad-vidaḥ

The Blessed Lord said—

1. This, the body, O son of Kunti, is called *kṣetra*; him, who knows it, they who know of them call *Ksetrajña*.

What is referred to by the pronoun '*this*' is specified (by the Lord) as '*the body*'. *O son of Kuntī*, this is *called*, mentioned as, *kṣetra*, the field,—because it is protected ("trāṇa") from injury ("kṣata"), or because it is destructible (kṣaya), or because it is liable to decay (kṣaraṇa), or because the fruit of action is reaped in it as in a field (kṣetra). *Him, who knows it*, the body, the field (kṣetra), from the sole of the foot to the head, through knowledge, natural or taught, as being distinct (from himself),—this knower—*they call*, mention as, *Kṣetrajña*, the knower of the field. Who are they (that designate him so)? Those *who know of them* both, the kṣetra and the Kṣetrajña.

Kṣetra and *Kṣetrajña* have thus been defined. Will knowing only this much about them suffice to understand them (fully)? No, says the Lord:

क्षेत्रज्ञं चापि मां विद्धि सर्वक्षेत्रेषु भारत ।
क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञयोर्ज्ञानं यत्तज्ज्ञानं मतं मम ॥ २ ॥

Kṣetrajñam cāpi mām viddhi sarva-kṣetreṣu Bhārata
Kṣetra-kṣetrajñayor-jñānam yat-taj-jñānam matam mama

2. Me, do you, also, know to be the *Kṣetrajña* in all *kṣetras*. O Bhārata, the knowledge of *kṣetra* and *Kṣetrajna* is considered by Me to be THE Knowledge.

Me, the Supreme Lord (Parameśvara) who is beyond saṁsāra, *do you, also, know to be the Kṣetrajña*, of the description given above, *in all kṣetras.* The meaning is: He, Kṣetrajña, who is differentiated by the manifold upādhis (attributes, limitations) of kṣetras from Brahmā down to a clump of grass,him you must understand as (Myself who is) devoid of all the various upādhis and beyond the scope of the concepts of 'sat' (existent) and 'asat' (non-existent) and the like.

O Bhārata,since, apart from the real nature of kṣetra, Kṣetrajña and Īśvara, there remains nothing to be comprehended through knowledge, therefore, *the knowledge*, i.e. that knowledge which comprehends, *the kṣetra and the Kṣetrajna*, which have to be known, *is considered by Me*, the Lord, Viṣṇu, *to be THE* true (perfect) *Knowledge.*

Objection:—If only a single Īśvara exists in all *kṣetras*, if there exists no other enjoyer different from Him, then it would follow that Īśvara is subject to *saṁsāra*; or, that, since there could not be any *saṁsārin*—i.e. anybody distinct from Īśvara—there is no *saṁsāra.* Both these conclusions are however unacceptable; for, then, Scripture which treats of bondage, liberation, and their causes, (all which pertain to *saṁsāra*), would become purposeless; and besides they (the said conclusions) are opposed to all evidence—direct sense-perception (*pratyakṣa*) and the rest. In the first place, *saṁsāra*, consisting of pleasure and pain and their causes, is (actually) comprehended (experienced by us) by direct sense-perception. And, from the perception of variety in the universe, we infer the fact of *saṁsāra*, as brought about by *dharma* and *adharma*. All this would be inexplicable if the Ātman (Self: *kṣetrajña* and Īśvara (the Lord) be identical.

Reply:—No; all these can be understood on the basis of the distinction between (the states of) *jñāna* (Knowledge) and *ajñāna* (ignorance). (*Śruti* says:) "Widely distinct and leading to different results are these—ignorance and that which is known as Knowledge (*Ka.I.ii.* 4). And in the same way, difference is pointed out in the results produced by Knowledge and ignorance,—mutually opposed (results), namely the good (*śṛeyas*) and the pleasant (*preyas*)—the good being the result of Knowledge and the pleasant being the result of ignorance. (*Ka*.I.ii. 1 nd 2). So also, Vyāsa says: "Then there are these two paths" etc. (*M.B*.-Ś'-240-6). "There are only these two paths" etc. Here (in the *Gītā-śāstra*) also two paths are spoken of (by the Lord). And it is known from *Śruti*, *Smṛti* and Nyāya (reasoning that *avidyā* (ignorance) with its result is to be got rid of through Knowledge. The *Śrutis* (to that effect) are the following:

"If here (in this life) one knows (the Self), the true (end of life) is gained; if he does not know (the Self) here, great is the calamity." (*Ke*.II.5).

"He who thus knows Him (the Supreme *Puruṣa*) becomes immortal here; there is no other path to reach the Goal" (*Puruṣa-Sūkta*; *Sv*. III.8).

"The wise man is not afraid on any account" (*Taj.II.ix*.1).

"He who knows Brahman is (one with) Brahman Itself (*Mu.III*.ii.9).

With respect to the ignorant person, on the other hand:

"But to him, there is fear" (*Tai*.II.vii.1);

"Dwelling amidst avidyā (ignorance)...(fools tread a tortuous path)" (*Ka*.I.ii.5).

"Whoever worships...thinking 'He is separate from me, and I am separate from Him', he does not know; he is to the devas (gods) as cattle" (*Bṛ*. I. iv.10); but the person who knows the Self—"He becomes all this" (*Br*. I. iv. 10).

"When man can roll up the sky like leather,....(then alone, without knowing God, can there be the end of sorrows)". (*Śv*. VI.20).

And thousands besides.

Also *Smṛti* texts such as the following (from the *Gīta* itself):

" Knowledge is enveloped in ignorance; hence do beings get deluded'' (V.15). ;

" Even in this world has birth been conquered by them whose mind rests in sameness'' (V.19);

"Seeing (the Lord) equally existent everywhere, ...(he reaches the Supreme Goal)'' (XIII.28).

Through reasoning (Nyāya) also (the same conclusion is reached). (It is stated:) "Being aware of (the presence of) serpents *kuśa*-throns, and wells, men avoid them; (but) due to ignorance (of their presence) some cast themselves into (or upon) them; therefore, see the superior effect in Knowledge (*M.B.Ś.* 201-16). In the same way, it can be understood that the ignorant man, identifying himself with the body etc., and performing righteous deeds (dharma) and unrighteous deeds (dharma) impelled by attachment, hatred, etc., is born and dies; while those who see the Self as distinct from the body, etc., by reason of their ceasing to engage themselves in righteous or unrighteous deeds consequent on their having quitted attachment, hatred, and the like, are liberated. This (conclusion reached by reasoning), none can refute by argument.

Such being the case, it appears, through the difference in the attributes (*upādhis*) set up by *avidyā*, as if the *Kṣetrajña*, who is (really) the Īśvara Himself, is subject to *saṁsāra*—even as the Self (Ātman) seems to be identical with the body (through *avidyā*). Indeed, it is the settled conclusion that the notion (of identity) of the Self with the body and the rest, whch are not-Self, entertained by all living beings in common, is caused by *avidyā*,—just as the decided (wrong) notion of a human being in a pillar is (i.e. the wrong notion of mistaking a pillar for a man in darkness). Even as thereby neither any essential nature of a human being accrues to the pillar, nor does any essential nature of the pillar accrue to the man, so also the nature of the spirit (Consciousness) never inheres in the body, nor does the nature of the body pertain to the conscious spirit; and so also pleasure, pain, and delusion,

etc. do not pertain to the Self, they being the products of *avidyā* (ignorance), in the same way as decay and death (which pertain to the body).

Objection:—Not so, as the two (cases) are not similar. The pillar and the human being are both objects of cognition (by the Self, the cogniser), and they are mistaken one for the other through ignorance, by the cogniser; but with regard to the body and the Self, taking one for the other occurs betwixt the cognised and the cogniser, and so the illustration does not apply; hence[2], an attribute of the body, though an object of cognition, can well pertain to the cogniser, the Self.

Reply:—Not so; for then it would lead to the conclusion that the Self is insentient etc. If (in fact) the attributes of the body etc.,—the *kṣetra*, an object of cognition,—such as pleasure, pain, delusion, desire, and hatred,—do pertain to the cogniser, then you will have to state the reason for the distinction: why only some of the attributes of the *kṣetra*, the object of cognition, which are imputed through ignorance, do pertain to the Self, while others such as decay and death do not[3]. On the contrary, it can well be inferred that they (pleasure etc.) do not pertain to the Self; because in the same way as decay and death, they are also ascribed through *avidyā*; also because they are to be shunned or sought after, and so on[4]. Such being the case, *saṁsāra*, characterised by (the Self being associated with) the notions of being a doer and an enjoyer, and resting on objects of cognition, is a (mere) ascription to the cogniser through *avidyā*; and consequently the cogniser is not affected in the least by it,—just as *ākāśa* (space) (is not affected) by the notions of its having a surface to being dirty, ascribed to it by the (childish) ignorant.

Thus, there is no possibility for the doubt that even the least trace of being a *saṁsārin* attaches to Īśvara, the Lord, the *Kṣetrajña*, though he exists in all *kṣetras*. Surely, nowhere in ordinary life,

2. because of identification of the Self with the body is no delusion. (Ā)

3. according to the objector (also) insentient attributes such as decay and death cannot pertain to the cognising self (which is sentient).

4. They are also objects of perception and material (*jaḍa*). (Ā)

is anything seen to be improved or spoiled by a property ascribed to it through ignorance.

As for the objection that the illustration is not similar, that (objection) cannot hold. How? The point of similarity between the illustration and the subject illustrated, intended to be brought out, is simply the ascription (of something) through *avidyā*; and that (point of similarity) does subsist. And, as to your contention that there is the point of dissimilitude with reference to the cogniser[5], it has been shown that it does not absolutely apply, as for instance in the case of decay etc[6].

Objection:—Because he possesses *avidyā*, the Kṣetrajña is a *saṁsārin*.

Reply:—No, for *avidyā* is a product of *tamas*. A notion born of *tamas* indeed is *avidyā*,—being of the nature of a veil—causing the comprehension of what is contrary, or establishing a doubt' or causing no comprehension whatever.

For, on the appearance of the light of discrimination, it ceases to exist; also because we perceive the three forms of *avidyā*—non-comprehension and the others—when there is some (eye-) disease such as blindness (*timira*) which is of the nature of a veil and is born of *tamas*[7].

objection:—Thus, then, *avidyā* is an inherent property (dharma) of the cogniser[8].

5. According to the objector, it is the invariable rule that only an object of cognition is falsely ascribed to another object of cognition; there cannot be a false ascription (of an object of cognition, the body) to the cogniser. (Ā)

6. There is no such invariable rule (as assumed by the objector). Because decay etc. are (admittedly) ascribed to the cognising soul by ordinary people. (Ā)

7. The three forms of *avidya* are thus seen to be due to some blemish and not absolute attributes of the Self. (Ā)

8. A blemish is only an instrumental cause and since contrariety etc. must have a material cause, the Self alone can be that material cause. [*Avidyā*, which is indeterminate, is not acceptable to the objector]. '*Avidyā*' in the text connotes the triad, non-comprehension etc. (Ā) [The triad consists of non-comprehension, comprehension of what is contrary and doubt.]

Reply:—No; for we see that diseases such as blindness are in the organ of sight.

(*Summing up to explain the objector's position*:) You say that *avidyā* is an inherent property of the cogniser; possessed of that inherent property of *avidyā*, the *Kṣetrajña* becomes a *saṁsārin*; and therefore, what is stated, that the *Kṣetrajña* is the Lord (Īśvara) Himself and not a *saṁsārin*, does not stand to reason.

(*We reply*:) Your view is incorrect. For, since we see that the diseases which cause perception of contrariety etc. are in the organ of sight (alone), neither the perception of contrariety etc., nor a defect such as blindness which is its cause, pertains to the perceiver. When blindness is removed through treatment of the eye, the percipient ceases to be subject to it (blindess and its results); and therefore it is not an inherent property of the percipient. In the same way, non-comprehension, comprehension of what is contrary, and doubt, as also their cause, can in all circumstances pertain only to some instrument, but not to the Kṣetrajña, the cogniser. And, besides, they being objects of congnition, cannot be inherent properties of the cogniser, like the light of a lamp. And precisely because they are objects of cognisance, they are cognisable through something other than the cogniser himself. And all the pilosophers admit that in the state of liberation, when all sense-organs are absent, there exists not the taint of *avidyā* etc. It they (perception of the contrary etc.) were inherent properties of the Kṣetrajña, in the same way as heat of fire, then never can there be the separation from them. Also, union with or separation from anything whatever is impossible with respect to the Self, which is changeless, all-pervading, and formless, like space. Wherefore, it is established that the Kṣetrajña is ever the same as Īśvara. The Lord also says (about Kṣetrajña), "Being without beginning, and devoid of guṇas" (XIII-31).

Objection:—In that case, there being no *saṁsāra* and no *saṁsārin*, there will be the undesirable consequence that the *Śāstra* (Scripture) serves no purpose and so on.

Reply:—Not so[9]; because it (the undesirable consequence

9. The objection is considered from the two possible alternatives: (1) whether it applies to the state of Knowledge, or (2) whether it applies to the state of ignorance. The former position is first considered. (Ā)

referred to) is accepted by all (philosophers); and that consequence which is accepted by all philosophers believing in the soul does not have to be explained away by only one of them.

Objects:—In what way do all philosophers admit it?

Reply:—All philosophers admitting the existence of the soul assent to the position that for liberated souls there is no connection with either *saṁsāra* or subjection to it (*saṁsāritva*). In their case, it is not considered that they lay themselves open to the objection that the *Śāstra* serves no purpose and so on. So also for us: when the Kṣetrajñas become one with Isvara, then let the *Śastra* serve no purpose.

But[10] it (*Śastra*) does serve its purpose in the domain of *avidyā*: just as for all dualists (*dvaitins*), the *Sāstra* and the like are of use only in the state of bondage, and not in the state of liberation, so also with us[11].

Objector:—For all of us, dualists, the states of bondage and of liberation are actual conditions of the soul, real in the true sense of the term; consequently there is actually something to be got rid of and something to be attained, and the means thereto are also real; and in that connection, Scripture (*Śastra*) and the like have their purpose to serve. But in the case of the non-dualists (*advaitins*), duality is not real, having been caused by *avidyā*, and the state of bondage of the Self is also unreal; hence Scripture and the like, having no scope, can serve no purpose.

Reply:—No; for, different states cannot be predicated of the Self. In case bondage and liberation be states of the Self, they must either exist together or in succession. But they cannot, indeed occur simultaneously, being mutually opposed, just as being at rest and in motion cannot (occur simultaneously) with respect to the same object. If they occur in succession, they should either be caused by something or somebody else, or they are uncaused by anything or anybody else. If they are uncaused by another, there will be the contingency of never being liberated from the state of bondage; and if they are caused by another,—

10. The second alternative is now discussed. (Ā)

11. i.e. they have their purpose to serve before the dawn of Knowledge. (Ā)

because they cannot exist (in the Self) of their own accord,—they cannot be real. Consequently, the assumed hypothesis[12] is stultified.

Moreover, in positing the sequence of the states of bondage, and liberation, the state of bondage will have to be allotted the earlier place, without a beignning but having an end; and this is contrary to all reason[13]. And, similarly, the state of liberation has to be admitted as having a beginning, but no end; and this is equally opposed to all reason[14]. Besides, it is impossible to establish the permanence of that (i.e. the Self) which, having been in one state, subsequently passes to another state.

If therefore, to escape the charge of non-permanence (of the Ātman), it be held that the different states of bondage and liberation have no connection with the Ātman,—then, the objection that the *Śāstra* becomes purposeless etc. becomes unavoidable, even for the dualists. Thus, the objection being common (to both the dualists and the non-dualists), it is not to be answered by the non-dualist (alone).

But, in fact[15], there is no futility of the *Śāstra*; for the *Śāstra* is concerned with the well-known un-wise man. It is only the ignorant who see the Self as, i.e. identify themselves with, the result and the cause[16], (both of which are) the not-Self; but not the wise. For, with regard to the wise, since they see the Self as different from both the result and the cause, there can be no possibility of

12. that the states of bondage and liberation are real states of the Self. (Ā)

13. That which has no beginning must be eternal, in the same way that the Self is. (A)

14. That which has a real beginning must have an end, in the same way as a piece of cloth. (Ā)

15. It may be doubted that as the objection is common to both non-dualism and dualism, there is no reason for devotion to *Śāstra*; therefore, the text proceeds to explain what was already stated, namely, that the *Sāstra* does serve its purpose in the domain of *avidyā*. (Ā)

16. (The idea of) being an enjoyer is the result, and (the idea of) being the agent is the cause. Or, the result is the body, and the cause is the *adṛṣṭa* (*karma* in subtle form, which produces that result.) (Ā)

identifying these two with the Self in the form 'I am (such, and such)'. Verily, not even the extremely dull-witted, the insane, and the like, see water and fire, or shadow and brightness, to be the same; much less can a wise man. It is therefore plain that the *Śāstra* treating of injunctions and prohibitions is inapplicable to him who sees the Self as different from the result and the cause.

As is well-known, when someone has been enjoined to perform an act in the words (i.e. addressed as), "Devadatta", (another person by name) Viṣṇumitra present in that place does not take it that he is the person enjoined (to do it), though he has heard the direction; but it is probable that he would understand so if he has not heard and grasped clearly to whom the direction has been given. So, also in the case of result and cause[17].

Objection:—Is it not indeed possible that, though there is the perception of the Self as different from the result and the cause' there may be the conception, as regards the purport of the *Śāstra*, brought about by natural connection[18]—namely, "I am enjoined to do this which leads to an undesirable consequence"—just as, even though there is the perception of separate individuality among father, son, etc., they understand the injunctions and prohibitions on one of them as applying to the others also (mutually)[19]?

Reply: It is not so. It is only prior to obtaining the knowledge that the Self is distinct (from the result and cause) that the identification of the Self with the result and the cause is possible.

Indeed, it is only when a person has duly carried out the injunctions and prohibitions (of the *Śāstra*) that he acquires the conviction that the Self is distinct from causes and results, and, not before. (*Br.Sū*. III-iv-26, 27). Therefore, it is settled that the *Śāstra*, comprising injunctions and prohibitions, applies only to the not-wise.

17. The unwise man who identifies himself with them is governed by the injunctions and prohibitions (of the Śāstra). (Ā)

18. *prākṛta-sambandha*: Prakṛti (nature) is *avidyā*; the connection (*sambandha*) produced by it is the identification with the body and the rest, which was experienced before the dawn of Knowledge. (Ā)

19. vide *Saṁpratti-vidyā*. (Br. I.v.17). (Ā)

Objection:—Since (according to non-dualists) those who see the separateness of the Self, as also those who merely see the body and the rest as the Self, are beyond the scope of injunctions and prohibitions such as, "He who desires *svarga* (heaven) should sacrifice", "*kalañja* should not be eaten"[20], therefore, there being no proper agent (to carry out the scriptural injunctions and prohibitions), the *Śāstra* becomes purposeless.

Reply:—Not so. Performance (of enjoined acts) and abstention (from prohibited acts) are possible, as is well-known,[21]. The knower of Brahman, who has realised the identity of the Lord (Īśvara) and the Kṣetrajña, does not indeed engage in action[22] So also, neither does he, the non-believer in the existence of the Self, engage himself in actions (prescribed by the *Śāstra*) as he thinks that there is no next world. But, as is evident to us all, that person who (simply) infers that there is a Self, (only) from scriptural teachings on injunctions and prohibitions, which would otherwise (i.e. if there be no Self) be inexplicable, but is ignorant of the exact nature of the Self, and who has got a strong desire for enjoyment of the fruits of the (Vedic) rites, engages himself (in them), being imbued with faith (in the *Śāstra*). Wherefore, the *Śāstra* cannot be deemed to be of no purpose.

Objection:—Seeing the wise not engaging (themselves) in (Vedic) rites, those who follow them may not also perform them; thus the *Śāstra* would be purposeless.

Reply:—Not so; (discriminatory) wisdom is possible for (only) some very rare individual. Indeed, among many men, it is only some one person who happens to be wise (in discrimination), as is seen even at present. Nor is it that the ingnorant follow the

20. Those who see the Self as different from the body etc. neither proceed to do an act nor refrain from another. And, those who merely see the body as the Self can have no thought of being an enjoyer in the next world. (Ā) Scriptural acts are only for attaining the higher world after death. *Kalañja* is flesh of an animal struck with a poisoned weapon.

21. Well-known, i.e. from the *Śāstra*. It is possible for him, who has only a remoter perception of a soul transcending the body etc., and has a direct perception that the body etc. are himself, to observe the injunctions and prohibitions in conformity with the *Śāstra*. (Ā)

22. neither does he refrain from action. (Ā)

wise man; for, what prompts action is evils such as desire, attachment. We also see people engaging in black magic and the like. Moreover, activity is natural (to man), as has indeed been said: "But it is nature that acts". (VI.14).

Therefore, *saṁsāra* is purely (the result of) *avidyā*, and is the sphere of the ignorant man who takes the world to be as it appears to him. Not to the pure Kṣetrajña do *avidyā* and its effect pertain. And, false knowledge can never contaminate the Supreme Reality. As is well-known, the water of a mirage can never make a desert miry with moisture; so also is *avidyā* incapable of doing anything to the *Kṣetrajña*. Wherefore has this been said: "Me do you, also, know to be the *Kṣetrajña*" (XIII.2); and "Knowledge is enveloped in ignorance" (V.15).

Objector:—Then, how is it that even the learned (*paṇḍitas*) believe, "I am thus"[23], "this is mine only"[24]—just as *saṁsārins do*?

Reply:—Listen; this much is their earning—the perception of the body (*kṣetra*) itself as the Self! If on the other hand, they, see (themselves as) the changeless *Kṣetrajña*, then they should not wish for enjoyment or action, with the idea, "these are for me"; for, enjoyment and action are but changes of state.

Thus, then, it is (only) the ignorant man that engages in action, being desirous of the fruit (of action). On the other hand, with respect to the Wise Man who sees the changeless Self, when the activity of the aggregate of his body and senses ceases,—since due to the absence of desire for any fruit (of action), there is no possibility of his being engaged in action—abstention from action *nivrtti*) is attributed to him figuratively[25].

There is also this another kind of learning, professed by some others: "The Lord Himself is the *Kṣetrajña*: and the *kṣetra* is diffe-

23. referring to superiority such as noble birth. (Ā)

24. referring to landed property, wife, etc. (Ā)

25. He neither acts prompted by scriptural injunction; nor can it be said that his withdrawal from activity is the consequence of (his consciously following scriptural pohibition. (Ā)

rent from and is the object of perception by (Him) the *Kṣetrajña*; but I am a *saṁsārin*, subject to pleasure and pain; the cessation of *saṁsāra* is to be achieved by me by direct perception of the *Kṣetrajña*, the Lord,—through the discriminative knowledge of the *kṣetra* and the *Kṣetrajña*, and meditation—and thereafter by dwelling in the true form of the Lord. He who gets such a belief[26] and he who teaches so, neither of them is the *Kṣetrajña*". He who holds this view and believes that he (thereby) makes the *Śāstra* treating of bondage and liberation purposeful, is a man of wretched learning; a slayer of the Self; ignorant himself, he confounds others as well, by setting aside what is actually taught and setting up something that is not taught, as a result of not knowing the traditional instruction (*saṁpradāya*) concerning the import of the *śāstras*. And so, one not knowing the traditional interpretation is to be despised as a mere fool, even though he may be learned in all *Śāstras*.

And, as regard the objections,—namely, that if Īśvara be one with the *Kṣetrajña*, He will be subject to *saṁsāra*, and that if the *Kṣetrajñas* be one with Īśvara, there being no *saṁsārins*, there can be no *saṁsāra*,—these charges have already been answered by expounding the distinction between the (states of) Knowledge and ignorance.[27]

Objector:—How?

Reply:—By the blemish (of being a *saṁsārin*) attributed through ignorance, the Real Being to whom it is attributed does not get tainted. And an illustration has also been given—that desert land is not made miry by the water of a mirage. And the objection that in the absence of a *saṁsārin* there can be no *saṁsāra* has been answered by explaining that both *saṁsāra* and the *saṁsārin* are fancied through ignorance (*avidyā*).

Objector:—His possession of *avidyā*, itself, constitutes the blemish of the *Kṣetrajña* being a *saṁsārin*; and its effect—being happy, miserable, etc.—is directly perceived.

26. The self is a *saṁsārin* different from the Lord (Paramātman); and he must attain to the state of the Lord through knowledge dependent on meditation. (Ā)

27. The identity of (*Kṣetrajña* and *Īśvara*) is real; while the *Kṣetrajña* (appearing as) being a *saṁsārin* is not real (Ā), being the result of *avidyā*.

Reply:—No; (for) anything that is perceived is an attribute of the *kṣetra*, and therefore the blemish caused by it cannot pertain to the knower, the *Kṣetrajña*. Whatever blemish, not really belonging to the *Kṣetrajña*, you attach to him, all of them—being objects of cognition—are simply the attributes of the *kṣetra* and not of the *Kṣetrajña*. And the *Kṣetrajña* does not become defiled by it, since intimate union of the knower with the known is impossible. If that (such intimate union) were possible, it (the blemish) could not be an object of cognition. If, indeed, being possessed of *avidyā* and being subject to misery and the like be the (true) attributes of the Self, how can they be directly perceived by the Self?[28] Or, how can they be said to be the properties of the *Kṣetrajña*[29]? It has been affirmed that everything that is cognised is the *kṣetra* (XIII-5, 6) and that the *Kṣetrajña* is the knower and none else (XIII. 1); consequently, in contradiction there of, to say that being possessed of *avidyā* and being subject to misery and the like are the attributes and the inherent properties of the *Kṣetrajña* and that they are directly perceived (to be such) is sheer arrogance, based on mere ignorance.

Now[30] asks (the opponent):—Whose (to whom or to what) is this *avidya*?[31]

28. If an essential property (*dhārma*) of himself can be perceived by the Self, the Self could also perceive himself (as an object); and there will be the contradiction of the object and the agent being identical. (Ā)

29. Being objects cognised, in the same manner as form etc. are, they cannot inhere in the Self. (Ā)

30. In what follows, the opponent *dvaitin* (dualist) seeks to establish that the *Kṣetrajña* is tainted with *avidyā*, while the proponent *advaitin* (non-dualist) shows that the *Kṣetrajña* can have no connection with *avidyā*, which is cognised by him and consequently must be distinct from him, the cogniser. The gloss of Ānandagiri is given below.

31. *Avidyā*, through which even mistaken notions are steadfastly maintained, cannot be an independent entity. It cannot rest on *Cit* (Consciousness), because there is no (second) entity besides *Cit*; and because *Cit* is of the nature of Knowledge (*Vidyā*), the opposite of *avidyā*, it cannot be the abode, Therefore the opponent wishes to know where *avidyā* rests.

Reply:—It is only there where it is seen[32].

Objector:—Where (in what or whom) is it seen?[33]

Reply:—As to this, we say that the question, "Where is *avidyā* seen?" is meaningless[34].

Objector:—How?

Reply:—If *avidyā* is perceived, you perceive also the person who possesses it. And, when the possessor of *avidyā* is perceived, it is not proper to ask, "Whose (where) is it?". When, for instance, the possessor of cows is seen (and known), there is no sense in asking "Whose are the cows?"

Objector:—The illustration is not parallel. Cows and their possessor being objects of direct perception, their relation is also an object of direct perception; and so the question is (certainly) meaningless. But *avidyā* and the possessor of *avidyā* are not both objects of perception in the same manner (as in the illustration); and only if they were (so) will the question be meaningless.

Reply:—If you know to what particular possessor of *avidyā*, (though he be) not directly perceived, *avidyā* is related, how does it serve you[35]?

32. The question may refer to either of two things: (i) whether *avidyā* does not need something else to rest on; or (ii) the particular entity whereon *avidyā* rests. In the former case, there is no need for the question; and hence the reply. To explain: *Avidyā* must be an object of cognition, or it is not. If it is an object of cognition, since it must be dependent on another, it should be cognised as resting (or inhering) in something else. If on the other hand *avidyā* be not an object of cognition, then, it being not manifest, how do you know that *avidyā* exists at all?

33. The opponent perhaps meant to ask what the particular entity is wherein *avidyā* inheres. He makes this clear by the question.

34. Since *avidyā* is an object of cognition, and since the particular entity in which it (apparently) inheres, namely the self, is established by one's own experience, there is no occasion for the question; hence the reply. This reply is further explained (in what follows) and made clear through an illustration in the commentary.

35. The objector points out that the illustration and the subject illustrated are not similar. The counter-question (of the *advaitin*) means: "Even though the possessor of *avidyā* is not directly perceived, he is well-known as the entity with whom *avidyā* is connected. Hence you cannot maintain the need for your question."

Objector:—Since *avidyā* is productive of evil, it has to be discarded.[36]

Reply:—He who has *avidyā* will (himself) get rid of it[37].

Objector:—Why, it is I who have *avidyā*.[38]

Reply:—Then, you (now) know *avidyā*, and the possessor of it to be yourself![39]

Objector:—I do know; but not through direct perception.[40]

Reply:—If you know the Self through inference[41], how can you comprehend the relation (of the Self with *avidyā*)? Surely, it is not possible for you, the cogniser, to comprehend your relation with *avidyā*, the object of cognition, at the same moment (that you are the cogniser of *avidyā*); for (then) *avidyā* stands merely as an object cognised by the cogniser[42]. And[43] there cannot be

36. Not understanding the implied sense of the counter-question, the opponent gives this answer.

37. Since it is he who has *avidyā* that has to rid himself of it, no one else need make the effort.

38. Because it is myself who have *avidyā*, I myself should try to get rid of it.

39. The Advaitin expresses his opinion, namely, "then, your question ("Whose is this *avidyā*?") is nonsensical".

40. Though knowing myself to have *avidyā*, I do not see it through the perception of any of the senses.

41. By the opponent's admission (that he knows, but not by direct perception) it is taken that he knows his Self through inference, such as thus: "I must be the possessor of *avidyā*, because I experience the effects of *avidyā*; if (I were) not, I should be like liberated souls (i.e. not feel the effects of *avidyā*).',

42. There is no reason, however, for accepting any relation between the Self and *avidyā*. Does the Self, the cogniser, himself cognise his own relationship with *avidyā*? Or, is there some other cogniser for it? The former cannot be true. At the moment when the Self is in the position of cogniser with respect to (his) *avidyā*, he grasps *avidya* as the object of cognition and the Self functions as the cogniser. How then, can the Self, at the same time, be the cogniser of the relationship of *avidyā* with himself since the same entity cannot function both as the agent of an action and as the object thereof, simultaneously?

43. The second alternative is now refuted.

a (i.e. another) cogniser who comprehends the relation between *avidyā* and its cogniser, nor also a separate cognition of it (the relation); for, that would lead to the fault of infinite regress (*an-avasthā*). If the cogniser as also (his) relation to the object of cognition can be cognised, we have to suppose another cogniser (of these), and yet another of him as well, and so on; and thus the fallacy of absence of finality (*anavasthā*) cannot be avoided.

If, on the other hand, *avidyā* or anything else is an object of cognition then it is ever the 'cognised' alone; so also, the cogniser is ever the cogniser only; he never becomes an object of cognition. Such being the case, the *Kṣetrajña*, the cogniser, is not in the least tainted by *avidyā*, subjection to misery, and the like[44].

Objector:—There is this very blemish, namely, that the Self is the cogniser of the *Kṣetra* which is full of blemishes.

Reply:—No; for it is only figuratively that the (Self, who is) changless Consciousness is spoken of as the cogniser—just as fire which is mere heat is figuratively spoken of as doing the function of heating.[45]

What has been taught by the Lord here—that the Self in Him-self is devoid of any connection with action, or with the accessories to action, or with the results, which being mere imputations through *avidyā* are attributed to the Self only figuratively —the same has He declared in other sections also, here and there, such as:

" He who takes the Self to be the slayer'' (II-19);

" Actions are everywhere performed by the *Guṇas* of *Prakṛti*'' (III.27);

44. Since the Self cannot be the object of cognition for himself or for anybody else, there is no evidence for any connection of him with *avidyā*. And, the Self ever reveals himself, in experience (as the cogniser). Hence the conclusion.

45. Does cogniser-ship (of the Self) connote being the agent of the act of cognition, or being of the nature of cognisance itself? The former cannot be, because that is not acceptable. As for the latter, cogniser-ship being merely a figurative ascription there cannot be any blemish accruing therefrom. Such figurative ascription in the absence of activity is illustrated by the example (of the fire).

"The Omnipresent takes note of the demerit or the merit of none" (V.15);

and we have also explained them accordingly. And we shall point out (the same) in later sections as well.

Objector:—Well, then; if action, or its accessories, or its results, have no connection with the Self in Himself, and if they are ascribed (to the Self) through *avidyā*, it follows that actions are to be performed by the ignorant alone, and are not intended for the Wise[46].

Reply:—True[47], it does so follow; and we shall show exactly this when commenting on the verse, "It is indeed not possible for an embodied being to relinquish action entirely" (XVIII-11). And, we shall expound this especially in the section summing up the purport of the whole (*Gītā-Śāstra* while commenting on). 'How, he, who has reached such perfection, attains to Brahman, that (which is the) supreme consummation of Knowledge, that in brief, O son of Kuntī, learn from Me" (XVIII-50). We conclude (the topic) for the present, as there is no need for further expatiation.

Now is set down this verse which begins, "And what that *kṣetra* is, and of what nature". (XIII.3); it is a summary of the import of this chapter on the *kṣetra*, beginning with the verse, "This, the body", etc. (XIII-1). For, it is indeed appropriate to indicate before-hand, in brief, the subject-matter proposed to be explained at length.

तत्क्षेत्रं यच्च यादृक्च यद्विकारि यतश्च यत् ।
स च यो यत्प्रभावश्च तत्समासेन मे शृणु ॥ ३ ॥

46. thereby contradicting the injunctions of Scripture such as: "The man who understands should sacrifice", and, "Having known, he should engage in action". (Ā)

47. For, the Scripture which prescribes those injunctions requires the knowledge of the distinction (between the soul and the body) on the part of the ritualist and not the conviction that the Self is free from (all attributes, such as) hunger, etc. (Ā)

Tat-kṣetram yacca yādṛkca yad-vikāri yataśca yat
Sa ca yo yat-prabhāvaśca yat-samāsena me śṛṇu

3. And what that *kṣetra* is, and of what nature, of what modifications, and whence is what, and also who He is, and what His powers,—that, hear from Me, in brief.

And what that kṣetra is, what the kṣetra spoken of is; "*that*" refers to what was indicated as 'this body' (XIII.1); *and of what nature*, of what sort by its own properties; *of what modifications*; *and whence is what*, from what causes what effects arise; *and aslo who He is*, who had been declared as the Kṣetrajña; *and what His powers*, the "śakti" due to "upādhis" (attributes)[48];—*that*, the true nature of the kṣetra and the Kṣetrajña in these particularised aspects, *hear from Me*, from My words, *in brief*; and having heard, know them accurately.

The (five) "*and*" signify that all these aspects should be understood together.

With a view to stimulating interest in the mind of the hearer the Lord praises the (Knowledge of the) true nature of the *kṣetra* and the *Kṣetrajña*, which has been spoken of.

ऋषिभिर्बहुधा गीतं छन्दोभिर्विविधैः पृथक् ।
ब्रह्मसूत्रपदैश्चैव हेतुमद्भिर्विनिश्चितैः ॥ ४ ॥

Ṛṣibhir-bahudhā gītam-chandobhir-vividhaiḥ pṛthak
Brahma-sūtra-padaiścaiva hetumadbhir-viniścitaiḥ

4. (The truth about *kṣetra* and *Kṣetrajña* has been) sung in many ways by Ṛṣis, and distinctively in various hymns, and also (sung) in words indicative of Brahman, full of reasoning and decisive.

48. such as the power of seeing, caused by the '*upādhi*' of the eye. (Ā)

Sung, declared, *by Ṛṣis*, such as Vasiṣṭha, *in many ways*; *and* sung *distinctively*, by discriminating (them as separate), *in various*, manifold, *hymns* of the Ṛg Veda and the others; *and* besides, *also*, *in words indicative of Brahman*, in passages which lead to the understanding of Brahman; by these also is the true nature of kṣetra and kṣetrajña declared. Indeed, it is only through passages indicative of Brahman, such as, "Only as the Self should one contemplate Him" (*Bṛ*.I.iv.7), that the Self is known. They are *full of reasoning*, *and decisive*—they give no room for doubt and produce settled conviction.

To Arjuna, who has been made to look forward (to the teaching), by (its) praise, the Lord says—

महाभूतान्यहंकारो बुद्धिरव्यक्तमेव च।
इन्द्रियाणि दशैकं च पञ्च चेन्द्रियगोचराः ॥ ५ ॥

Mahā-bhutānyahaṁkāro buddhir-avyaktam-eva ca
Indriyāṇi daśaikam ca pañca cendriya-gocarāḥ

5. The great elements, egoism, intellect, and also the Unmanifested; the ten senses and the one, and the five objects of sense;

(The sentence is completed in the next verse.)

The great elements: they are great, because they pervade all modifications (of matter). The elements referred to here are the subtle ones (sūkṣma),—the gross (sthūla) elements being designated as 'the objects of sense'. *Egoism*, the 'I-concept', which is the cause of the 'great elements'; *Intellect*, characterised by determination, which is the cause of Ahaṁkārā (Egoism); *and also the Un-manifested*, which is its (intellect's) cause, namely the Avyākṛta (the Undifferentiated), the Power of the Lord (Īśvara-śakti), spoken of as the "Divine Illusion of Mine, difficult to cross over" (VII.14)[49]. (In "and also the unmanifested") the word 'also' ("eva") has the sense of indicating the limits of Prakṛti, namely, that Prakṛti is just so much, divided eightfold (in the said manner);

49. The Iśvara-śakti, referred to as the *Avyakta* (*Avyākṛtra*) is different from *Caitanya* (the essence of all being and root of consciousness). (Ā)

the word 'and' ("ca") signifies that the (eight) different forms are to be taken together.

The ten senses: the five senses, hearing and the others, which are (known as) the 'buddhi-indriya's (senses of knowledge) because they produce knowledge, and the five 'karma-indriya's (senses of action), speech, hand and the others, so called because they execute action; all these (both these groups) make up the ten; *and the one*, the mind (manas), which is the eleventh, composed of thoughts and volition (saṁkalpa); *and the five objects of sense*, sound etc. All these, the Sāṁkhyas (i.e. the adherents of one of the six darśanas (Philosophies) called Sāṁkhya) speak of as the twenty-four principles (tattvas)[50].

Now, the Lord says that even those which the Vaiśesikas (adherents of another darśana, going by the name Vaiśeṣika) declare as the inherent attributes of the Self (*ātma-guṇas*) are merely the attributes of *kṣetra* (matter), and not of the *Kṣetrajña*:

इच्छा द्वेषः सुखं दुःखं संघातश्चेतना धृतिः ।
एतत्क्षेत्रं समासेन सविकारमुदाहृतम् ॥ ६ ॥

Icchā deveṣaḥ sukham duḥkham saṁghātaś-cetanā dhṛtiḥ
Etat-kṣetram samāsena savikāram-udāhṛtam

6. Desire, hatred, pleasure, pain, the aggregate, intelligence, fortitude;—the *kṣetra* has been thus briefly described with its modifications.

Desire is that which makes a man, who has experienced an object of pleasurable nature of a certain kind, on again observing an object of the same kind, to seize it as being conducive to a happi-

50. *Mūla-prakṛtiravikṛthi, mahadādyāḥ prakṛtī-vikṛtayaḥ sapta, ṣoḍaśaśca vikāraḥ: na prakṛtir-na vikṛtiḥ puruṣaḥ.* (*Sāṁkhya-kārika* 3). See also note 88.

The "Sāṁkhya Yoga" of *Gita*'s second chapter, and the Sāṁkhyas the Lord often refers to, do not denote the traditional Śaṁkhya-darśana and its adherents but Jñāna and Jñānins.)

ness; this, desire, is a property of the inner-sense (antaḥ-karaṇa); and it is "kṣetra" (matter), because it is knowable. So also, *hatred* is that which makes a man, who as experienced an object of painful nature of a certain kind, on again observing an object of the same kind, to dislike it; this hatred is "kṣetra" only, because it is knowable. So also, *pleasure*,—of the nature of the agreeable, the propitious (or soothing), composed of "sattva", (vitality), is only "kṣetra", because it is knowable. *Pain* is what is unfavourable or disagreeable; it is also "kṣetra", because it is know. able. *The aggregate* is the combination of the body and the senses. *Intelligence* is that condition of the inner-sense (antaḥ-karaṇa-manifested in it, the aggregate, pervaded by the semblance (reflected light) of the Consciousness of the Self ("ātma-caitanya-ābhāsa")—just as fire in a red hot mass of metal; it is also "kṣetra", because it is knowable. *Fortitude* is that by which the body and the senses are supported when they get fatigued; it is also "kṣetra", because it is knowable.

Desire and the rest, mentioned here, are intended to denote all the qualities (properties) of the inner-sense[51];

Wherefore, the Lord concludes what has been declared:—*the kṣetra has been thus briefly described with its modifications,* Mahat[52] and the rest.

The "kṣetra"—the aggregate of whose varied modifications has been spoken of as 'this body......the kṣetra' ((XIII.1)—has been expounded in all its different forms, beginning from 'the great elements' and ending with 'forttiude' (XIII-5, 6)[53].

The *Kṣetrajña* is characterised by the distinguishing marks which will (soon be described (XIII-12 et.seq.). From a thorough knowledge of this *Kṣetrajña* and his glory, immortality results.

51. Desire etc. are indicative, by implication, of all other *buddhi-dharmas* (attributes of the intellect), such as resolve. (Ā)

52. i.e. what stands for the Cosmic Intelligence in the Sāṃkhya phyilosophy.

53. The exposition of the *kṣetra* is for the purpose of creating indifference (*vairāgya*) towards it; for only he who has become indifferent to it becomes qualified to Knowledge. The 'modifications' refer to those of the individual body (*vyaṣṭi-deha*) and the 'aggregate' to the cosmic body (*samaṣṭi-śarīra*). (Ā)

(Therefore), the Lord Himself describes the *Kṣetrajña* with his characteristic marks, in the section beginning from "That which has to be known, I shall describe" (XIII-12 to 17).

But now, the Lord lays down the complete means to that Knowledge, denoted by 'humanility) etc.,—on possessing which one becomes qualified for, and entitled to, the knowledge of that Knowledge, and intent on which the saṁnyāsin is said to be a firm devotee in the path of Knowledge,—which group (humility etc.), being the means of obtaining Knowledge, is (itself) spoken of (verse 11) as Knowledge (*jñāna*).

अमानित्वमदम्भित्वमहिंसा क्षान्तिरार्जवम् ।
आचार्योपासनं शौचं स्थैर्यमात्मविनिग्रहः ॥७॥

Amānitvam-adambhitvam-ahimsā kṣāntir-ārjavam
Ācaryopāsanam śaucam sthairyam-ātma-vinigrahaḥ

7. Humility; unpretentiousness; non-violence; forbearance; uprighteness; service of the teacher; purity; steadiness; self-control;

(The sentence is completed in verse II).

Humility, absence of self-esteem or praising oneself; *unpretentiousness*, not proclaiming one's own virtues; *non-violence*, doing no injury to living beings; *forbearance*', remaining unaffected on being wronged by another; *uprightness*, absence of crookedness; *service of the teacher*, performing acts of service to the preceptor who teaches the means of attaining Mokṣa; *purity* (external and internal; the former secured by) washing away dirts from the body by means of earth and water,and (the latter secured internally by) the removal from the mind of impurities such as attachment, through the perception of their adverse effects[54]; *steadiness*, concentration of all efforts in the path of release (Mokṣa) alone; *self-control*, restraining the aggregate of the body and the senses, which acts prejudicial to oneself, and is (commonly) spoken of as the "ātmā"; (self); (that is to say) confining it—which has a natural tendency to be active in all directions—to the right path (virtuous conduct) only;

54. i.e. by seeing the evil in all sense-objects. (Ā)

As also,

इन्द्रियार्थेषु वैराग्यमनहंकार एव च ।
जन्ममृत्युजराव्याधिदुःखदोषानुदर्शनम् ॥ ८ ॥

Indriyārtheṣu vairāgyam-anahaṁkāra eva ca
Janma-mṛtyu-jarā-vyādhi-duḥkha-doṣāmudarśanam

8. The renunciation of sense-objects; and also the absence of egoism; reflection on the evils of birth, death, old age, sickness and pain;

The renunciation of sense-objects, absence of attachment for sound and the rest, i.e. for sense-pleasures, seen and unseen; *and also the absence of egoism*; *reflection on the evils of births, death, old age, sickness and pain*, perception of the evil that exists in every one of these—in birth, in death, in old age, in diseases, and in agonies: the evil in birth, consisting of dwelling in the womb and passing out of the female organ; similarly with respect to death[55]; the evil in old age, consisting in the suppression of intelligence' power and lustre, and also in being dis-respected; so also the evil[56] caused by diseases,such as headache; and by pain arising in oneself (ādhyātmika), that caused by animals and others (ādhibhautika), and that by fate (ādhidaivika).

Or, to give another interpretation, pain ("duḥkha") itself is evil ("doṣa"); and it is to be perceived in birth and the rest, as before: birth is a misery, death is a misery, old age is a misery, and diseases are a misery. Birth, etc., are all miseries, because they are the causes of misery; not that they are miseries in themselves.

From such reflection on the evils of misery in birth etc. arises indifference to the pleasures of the body and the senses; and, thereupon, the senses turn towards the inner-Self for the vision of the Self. Being thus the means to Knowledge, reflection on the evils of birth etc. is (itself) spoken of as Knowledge (in verse 11).

55. such as destruction of the vital parts of the body. (Ā)

56. unbearableness. (Ā)

And besides,

असक्तिरनभिष्वङ्गः पुत्रदारगृहादिषु ।
नित्यं च समचित्तत्वमिष्टानिष्टोपपत्तिषु ॥ ९ ॥

Asaktir-anabhiṣvaṅgaḥ putra-dāra-gṛhādiṣu
Nityam ca sama-cittatvam-iṣṭāniṣṭopapattiṣu

9. Non-attachment; absence of affection for son, wife, home and the like; and constant even-mindedness on the attainment of (both) the desirable and the undesirable;

Non-attachment, absence of liking for objects which are productive of attachment; *absence of affection for son, wife, home and the like*: affection is an intense form of attachment, characterised by complete identification (of oneself with another), as (is seen) in the case of a person who feels, "I am myself happy, I am myself miserable", when another is happy or miserable, and "I am myself alive, I have perished", when another is alive or dead; absence of affection, for what?—for sons, wifes, homes, and the like, that is, for others also that are very dear,such as servants. These two (non-attachment and absence of affection) also are said to be Knowledge, because they are means to Knowledge.

And constant even-mindedness, equanimity, mental indifference, *on the attainment of the desirable and the undesirable*: that is to say, he who possesses this (even-mindedness) does not feel delighted on attaining the desirable, and does not get irritated on the occurrence of the undesirable; this constant even-mindedness is also Knowledge[57].

Also,

मयि चानन्ययोगेन भक्तिरव्यभिचारिणी ।
विविक्तदेशसेवित्वमरतिर्जनसंसदि ॥ १० ॥

57. i.e. it is conducive to Knowledge. (Ā)

Mayi cānanya-yogena bhaktir-avyabhicāriṇī
Viviktadeśa-sevitvam-aratir-jana-saṁsadi

10. Unswerving devotion to Me by the *Yoga* of non-separation; resort to sequestered places; distaste for the society of men;

Unswerving devotion to Me, the Lord (Īśvara), *by the yoga of non-separation*, by "apṛthak-samādhi", namely the determined and undeviating conviction (buddhi) that there is none other than the Supreme Lord, Vāsudeva, and that therefore He is our sole Refuge; and this (undeviating devotion) is Knowledge[58]. *Resort to sequestered places*, either naturally free, or artificially made free, from impurities etc., as also from fear of serpents, thieves, tigers, and the like,—such as a forest, sand-banks of a river, the temple of a god. Because it is only in secluded spots that the mind becomes composed, meditation on the Self and the like[59] is possible (only) in such a place. Therefore, resort to sequestered places is said to be Knowledge[60]. *Distaste for society of men*, i.e. of the common, un-cultured and undisciplined multitude, and not of the refined (cultured) and disciplined men,—because the company of the latter is helpful to Knowledge. Wherefore, distaste for the society of ordinary worldly men is Knowledge, since it conduces to Knowledge.

And also,

अध्यात्मज्ञाननित्यत्वं तत्त्वज्ञानार्थदर्शनम् ।
एतज्ज्ञानमिति प्रोक्तमज्ञानं यदतोऽन्यथा ॥ ११ ॥

Adhyātma-jñāna-nityatvam tattva-jñānārtha-darśanam
Etaj-jñānam-iti proktam-ajñānam yadato(a)nyathā

58. because, it is conducive to Knowledge. (Ā)

59. i.e. the Paramātman and the purport of the *Mahāvākyas*. (Ā). The *Mahā-vākyas* are the Upaniṣadic declarations about the identity of *Jīva* (the Individual soul) and Brahman.

60. i.e. it is also a means to Knowledge. (Ā)

11. Constancy in spiritual knowledge; understanding the purpose of the knowledge of Truth;—all this is declared to be Knowledge; and what is opposed to this is ignorance.

Constancy in spiritual knowledge, uninterrupted application to knowledge concerning the Self etc.[61]; *understanding the purpose of the knowledge of Truth*: when the development of the several means to knowledge,—namely, humility and the rest—, matures, knowledge of Truth arises; its purposes is Mokṣa, liberation, the cessation of saṁsāra; and it is only when this aim of True Knowledge is well-perceived that one will take to the practice of the means of attaining that Knowledge.

All this, all that has been enumerated beginning from 'humility' (verse 7) and ending with 'understanding the purpose of the knowledge of Truth', *is declared to be Knowledge*, because it is conducive to Knowledge. *And what is opposed to this*, the aforesaid (Knowledge)—namely, the contraries, pride, hypocrisy, cruelty, intolerance crookedness, etc.—*is ignorance*. These (opposites, also) should be understood, in order that they may be avoided, as being the cause of saṁsarā persistence.

What is that which has to be known through the aforesaid knowledge? In answer to this question, the Lord says: "That which has to be known" etc. (XIII-12 et seq.).

Objection:—Humility and the rest are only '*yama*' and '*niyama*' (physical and mental self-control); through them the Knowledge cannot be perceived; (for) nowhere is it seen that humility and the rest serve to determine precisely the nature of anything. But, in all cases, it is seen that only the knowledge concerning a particular thing serves to comprehend the nature of that object (of knowledge), while, to be sure, a quite different thing cannot be known through the knowledge concerning another matter, just as fire (is not comprehended) through the knowledge of a pot.

61. 'etc.' refers to the 'not-Self'. Fixedness in discriminating (the Self from the not-Self) leads to the understanding of the import of the *Mahā-vākyas* (Ā).

Reply:—This objection has no force; for we have indeed stated that they (humility etc.) are termed 'Knowledge', as being (only) conducive to Knowledge; and also because they are secondary (co-operative) aids to Knowledge.

ज्ञेयं यत्तत्प्रवक्ष्यामि यज्ज्ञात्वाऽमृतमश्नुते ।
अनादिमत्परं ब्रह्म न सत्तन्नासदुच्यते ॥ १२ ॥

Jñeyam-yat-)at-pravakṣyāmi yaj-jñātvā(a)mṛtam-aśnute

Anādimati-Param-Brahma na sat-tannāsad-ucyate

12. That which has to be known I shall describe; knowing which, one attains the Immortal; (which is) the beginning-less, the Supreme Brahman. It is not said to be 'sat' or 'asat'.

That which has to be known, I shall fully *describe*, exactly as It is,. The Lord says what the result of knowing It will be, so as to make the hearer ready for that knowledge, by creating interest in him: *knowing which*, i.e. that which has to be known, *one attains the Immortal*, i.e. immortality; he is no more subject to death.

The beginning-less: It is that which has no beginning:—What is that?—*the Supreme*[62], the un-surpassed One, the *Brahman*, which is being spoken of as 'That which has to be known'.

Here some split the expression "anadimat-param" (beginning-less-(and)-Supreme) into "anadi-matparam" (beginningless-(and)-absorbed in Me), on the ground that by interpreting it through ("anadimat"—)a 'bahu-vrīhi' compound, the expression 'mat' is rendered useless[63]; which is not desirable; and, they give out a

62. Even the *Avyākṛta* (the prime germ of *Prakṛti*) is beginningless; hence the question, and the reply which shows that a different entity is meant. (Ā)

63. The *bahu-vrīhi* compound '*anādimat*' means 'having no beginning'; and in conveying that meaning, the (possessive) '*mat*' has no significance, because the word '*anādi*' itself gives the same meaning. (Ā). See Note 49, Chapter X.

different meaning: It (Brahman) is *mat-para* ("absorbed in Me"), because I, called Vāsudeva, am Its supreme Śakti (Power). (Against this, we say:) True, superfluity might be avoided in that manner, provided the suggested interpretation were possible; but the interpretation is incompatible, because it is intended that Brahman should be made understood only by denying It all specific attributes, by declaring: "It is not said to be 'sat' or 'asat' ". And, to declare Brahman as possessed of a special Sakti[64] and (at the same time) as devoid of specific attributes is self-contradictory. Therefore, even though the 'bahu-vrīhi'' gives the same meaning (as without the 'mat'), (it should be understood that) the 'mat' has been employed for completing the verse-form (according to prosodic rules).

Having created interest (in Arjuna) by saying, "I shall describe That which has to be known, That which leads to immortality", and thereby made him look forward (to that teaching), the Lord proceeds—

It, That which has to be known, *is not said to be 'sat'*, existent *or* even *'asat'*, non-existent.

Objection:—Having made a good deal of preparation[65], and proclaimed very loudly, "I shall describe That which is to be known", is it not inconsistent to say, "It is not said to be *'sat'* or *'asat'*?

Reply:—No; what has been said (by the Lord) is appropriate, How? For, in all Upaniṣads, That which is to be known, Brahman. is defined only by denying all specialities, "Not thus, Not thus" (*Bṛ*. II.iii.6 and IV.iv.22), "Not gross, not subtle" (*Bṛ*.III.viii.8)—, that is, "It is not this"—, because, it is beyond the range of speech.

Objection:—That thing which cannot be spoken of as 'existent' does not itself exist. Therefore, it That which has to be known cannot be spoken of as existent, It does not exist. And it is a con-

64. To describe Brahman as being absorbed in Vāsudeva can only mean that the Attributeless is absorbed in the Attributed, and it is 'Śakti (Power' that is the source for all the attributes.

65. The expression in the text literally means ' girded up the loins ".

tradiction to say that 'It is the knowable', and (at the same time) that 'It cannot be spoken of as existent'.

Reply:—Neither, indeed, is It non-existent, for It is not an object of the concept of non-existence.

Objection:—All states of consciousness involve either the cognisance of existence or that of non-existence. It being so, that which is to be known should also be the object of the cognition accompanied with the consciousness of existence, or the object of the cognition accompanied with the consciousness of non-existence[66].

Reply:—Not so; for, being beyond the range of the senses, It cannot be an object of the cognition accompanied with the awareness of either (existence or non-existence). Indeed, it is only that thing which is perceivable by the senses, such as a pot, that can be the object of the cognition accompanied with the awareness of existence, or an object of the cognition accompanied with the awareness of non-existence. But this entity, That which is to be known, is beyond the range of the senses and is to be learnt solely through the testimony of *Śabda* (Revelation). It cannot therefore be, like a pot etc., an object of cognition accompanied with the awareness of either (existence or non-existence); hence, It is not said to be '*sat*' or '*asat*'.

As to the objection that it is a contradiction to say that 'It is the knowable' and that 'It cannot be said to be *sat* or *asat*', (we say that) there is no contradiction; for, as the *Śruti* says, "It is other than the known and is beyond the unknown". (*Ke.*I.3).

Objection:—Even the *Śruti* (quoted) is self-contradictory[67]—just as another *Śruti*, when after (relating the) putting up (of) the hall for the sacrifice[68], says: "Who knows it—whether there is (any god) in the next world or not"? (*Tait. Sam.* VI.1.1.).

66. If not, there is no escape from the conclusion that Brahman is undefinable. (Ā)

67. And so, it is not acceptable as authority, since what is acceptable as authoritative should not contradict itself. (Ā)

68. The sacrifice referred to is for attaining the fruit in the next world.

Reply:—Not so; for the *Śruti* which speaks of It as other than the known and beyond the unknown has the object of presenting that entity which is certainly to be known[69]. On the other hand, the *Śruti*, "Who knows it", etc., is subsidiary to an injunction and is an *artha-vāda*[70].

It also stands to reason that Brahman cannot be expressed in words such as 'existent' and 'non-existent'. Indeed, every word employed to make something known, and is heard by listeners, signifies the thing indicated, through mutually accepted conventional usage (of the word) as associated with a certain genus (*jāti*), or a certain act (*kriyā*), or a certain quality (*guṇa*), or a certain mode of relation (*saṁbandha*); it is not seen to be comprehended otherwise. Thus, 'cow' and 'horse' indicate genera; 'cooks' and 'reads' indicate acts; 'white' and 'black' indicate qualities; 'wealthy' and 'cattle-owning' indicate relation (of possession). On the other hand, Brahman does not belong to any genus[71], and therefore It cannot be denoted by such words as '*sat*' (existent). It is devoid of attributes, and therefore, not possessing any qualities[72], It cannot be denoted by words indicating quality. Being devoid of action, It cannot be denoted by words indicating an act. *Śruti* says: "Without parts, action-less, and tranquil". (*Sv*.VI.19). It is not related (to anything else); for, It is the (only) One Being. And, since It is without a second, not an object (of the senses), and the very Self, it is proper to say that I cannot be expressed by any words whatever,—as has been stated in *Śruti* texts such as: "Whence all words return" (*Tai*.II.iv.1 and II.ix.1).

69. It is to be accepted as authority, since it teaches that Brahman is no other than one's own Inner Self. (Ā)

70. It does not really mean what it says, and is therefore no authority in itself. (Ā) (*Artha-vāda* is not a *vidhi* (rule or injunction) but just an explanatory statement coupled with legends and illustrations, recommending a *vidhi*.)

71. *Śruti* denies to Brahman race (*gotra*), colour (*varṇa*) etc. (Ā) (*Mu*.I.1.6)

72. It is *kevala* (Pure, Absolute) and *nirguṇa* (devoid of qualities) (*Śv*.VI.11). (Ā)

It may be doubted that, because the 'Knowable' is not an object of the concept denoted by the term '*sat*' (existent). It is '*asat*' (non-existent)[73]. To dispel such a doubt, the Lord proceeds to assert Its existence, as inferable through the *upādhis* (conditioned attributes, viz.,), the senses of all living beings[74].

सर्वतः पाणिपादं तत्सर्वतोऽक्षिशिरोमुखम् ।
सर्वतः श्रुतिमल्लोके सर्वमावृत्य तिष्ठति ॥ १३ ॥

Sarvataḥ pāṇi-pādam tat-sarvato(a)kṣi-śiro-mukham
Saryataḥ śrutimalloke sarvam-āvṛtya tiṣṭhati

13. With hands and feet everywhere, with eyes and heads and mouths everywhere, with ears everywhere,— That exists, enveloping all in the universe.

The Knowable is *with hands and feet everywhere*. The existence of the Kṣetrajña is ascertained through the upādhis (limiting adjuncts), the sense-organs of all living beings[75]. And the Kṣetrajña (the sentient principle behind the sense-organs) is so called because of the upādhi of the kṣetra; and this kṣetra consists of various forms such as hands and feet. All the variety noticed in the Kṣetrajña, through the difference in the upādhis of the kṣetra, is mere illusion; and therefore it has been said that It should be known through discarding all the variety, in the words: "It is not said to be 'sat' or 'asat'" (XIII.12).

73. That which is devoid of all characteristics and is beyond the reach of speech and thought cannot be perceived (comprehended); and everything that is perceived (comprehended or experienced) is of the nature contrary (to that stated); so Brahman must be a non-entity (*sūnya*). (Ā)

74. The Lord shows that Brahman exists (1) as the Inner Self (*pratyak*), (2) as that which is the origin of the activity of the senses etc., (3) as that which imparts an existence (*satta*) and the capacity to manifest itself (*sphūrti*) to all duality which is the product of imagination, and (4) as being the Lord of the universe (Īśvara). (Ā)

75. Behind insentient objects in motion, such as a chariot, there must be a sentient being which deliberates. So also, the activity of the senses which are insentient, must have behind it the self-conscious principle which presides and directs. (Ā)

Even though what is caused by upādhi is an illusory form, it is imagined as if it were a mode of the Knowable, and the statement, "It has hands and feet everywhere", is made with a view to indicating Its existence. Accordingly, there is the saying of those who know the traditional teaching (saṁpradāya-vids)—"That which is beyond all phenomena (niṣ-prapañca) is explained through super-imposition (adhyāropa) and negation (apavāda), (i.e. erroneous attribution and subsequent refutation thereof)".

Every-where (at all places and times) hands, feet, etc., which are comprehended as limbs of all bodies, function in their respective spheres of activity (only) in consequence of the Power of the Knowable[76]; and as such they serve as evidence (marks) of the existence of the Knowable; and they are spoken of as belonging to the Knowable only figuratively. The rest should also be interpreted similarly: in the manner that the Knowable is with hands and feet everywhere. It is *with eyes and heads and mouths everywhere, with ears*, the organs of hearing, *everywhere*[77]. *That exists, enveloping*, completely pervading, *all, in the universe*, the entirety of animal creation.

From the attribution of hands, feet, and other organs, which are merely superimposed on It, it is not proper to entertain the doubt that the Knowable is really possessed of those attributes (upādhis). To teach this, the (next) verse proceeds—

सर्वेन्द्रियगुणाभासं सर्वेन्द्रियविवर्जितम् ।
असक्तं सर्वभृच्चैव निर्गुणं गुणभोक्तृ च ॥ १४ ॥

Sarvendriya-guṇābhāsam sarvendriya-vivarjitam
Asaktam sarva-bhṛccaiva nirguṇam guṇa bhoktṛ ca

76. The Power (*Śakti*) of the Knowable (i.e. Brahman) is the capacity of inducing the activity of the limbs etc. by Its mere Presence. (Ā)

77. The mention of eyes and ears is indicative of the other senses of knowledge; and that of hands, feet, and mouths, of the other organs of action; we have also to include the mind (*manas*) and the intellect (*buddhi*). (Ā)

14. Shining by the functions of all the senses, (yet) without the senses; un-attached, yet the sustainer of all; devoid of *guṇas*, yet the enjoyer of (all) *guṇas*.

Shining by the functions of all the senses, the organs of knowledge and the organs of action, such as ears. The phrase "all the senses" should be understood as including the inner senses—buddhi and manas—because of the similarity, in their case as well, of being the upādhis of the Knowable. Moreover, even the organs of hearing and the rest become upādhis (of the Knowable), only through the upadhi of the inner-sense (antaḥ-karaṇa). Accordingly, It shines, manifests Itself, through the upādhis of the internal and the external senses, namely, the functions of all the senses, such as determination, volition, hearing, and speech. The meaning is that the Knowable appears as if engaged (in activity) through the functioning of all the senses. The Śruti says: "It meditates as it were; It moves as it were". (Bṛ.IV.iii.7).

Why should we not take it that It does actually engage in action? As to this, the Lord says: It is *without the senses*, that is to say, It is destitute to all senses; wherefore, the Knowable does not (actually) engage in activity, by the functioning of the senses. And, as for the scriptural text, "Without hands and feet, He is swift and grasps; He sees without the eye; He hears without the ear" (Śv.III.19), it has the object of showing that the Knowable has the capacity to partake of the same qualities (or functions) as those of all the senses, which are its upādhis; and is not for declaring that It actually possesses activity such as quick motion. The meaning of that sacred text should be taken as similar to that of the sacred text, "The blind one saw the gem" (Tai.Ār.I.11)[78].

Because the Knowable is destitute of all senses, therefore It is *unattached*, devoid of all contracts. Even though It is so, *yet* It is *the sustainer of all*. Indeed, everything has for its abode the 'Sat'—the Existent; for, everywhere the perception of 'Sat' persists. Even a mirage and the like do not verily occur in the absence of a basis. Hence, It is said to be the sustainer of all, the supporter of all.

78. This is an *artha-vāda*, not having its literal meaning as its purport; and therefore it cannot contradict the main subject on hand. (Ā)

There is this yet another means to the knowledge of the existence of the Knowable: though *devoid of the guṇas*, Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas,—*yet*, the Knowable is *the enjoyer of all guṇas*; that is to say, the Knowable is the enjoyer, the perceiver, of the guṇas, Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas,— which transform themselves into pleasure, pain and delusion—, through sound and other objects of the senses.

(It is) also—

बहिरन्तश्च भूतानामचरं चरमेव च ।
सूक्ष्मत्वात्तदविज्ञेयं दूरस्थं चान्तिके च तत् ॥ १५ ॥

Bahir-antaśca bhūtānām-acaram carameva ca
Sūkṣmatvāt-tad-avjñeyam dūrastham cāntike ca tat

15. Without and within (all) beings; the unmoving as also the moving; because subtle, It is incomprehensible; and It is far and near;

(The sentence is completed in the next verse.)

Without, i.e. external to the body, which extends upto and includes the skin, and which is fancied through ignorance as one's own self; *and within*, referring to the Inner Self (the Pratyagātman) lying inside the body aforesaid, of all *beings*.

From the statement that It is without and within (the body), it may be thought it does not exist in between[79]; hence, the Lord says; It is *the unmoving as also the moving*; that which appears as the bodies, moving and unmoving, that also is the Knowable;—this is similar to the rope appearing as a snake.

Question:—If all objects of the workaday world, the moving as also the unmoving, be the Knowable, then, how is it that It is not comprehended by everybody as "This It is"?

79. i.e. in the body, which lies between the *Pratyagātman* and external objects. (Ā)

Reply:—True, It manifests as everything; but it is subtle[80], like ākāśa (space). Therefore, *because* It is *subtle* in Its natural form *It*, though 'Knowable'. *is incomprehensible* to the ignorant, the un-enlightened. But to the enlightened, It is ever known, in accordance with scriptural authorities such as the following—

"All this is the Self alone" (Ch. VII.xxv.2; Bṛ.II.IV.6);

"All this is Brahman alone" (Bṛ. II.v.1).

As the unknown, *It is far*, since It is unattainable by the un-enlightened even in several crores of years. *And* It is *near* to the enlightened, being their very Self.

Also—

अविभक्तं च भूतेषु विभक्तमिव च स्थितम् ।
भूतभर्तृ च तज्ज्ञेयं ग्रसिष्णु प्रभविष्णु च ॥ १६ ॥

Avibhaktam ca bhūteṣu vibhaktam iva ca sthitam
Bhūta-bhartṛ ca taj-jñeyam grasiṣṇu prabhaviṣṇu ca

16. and impartible, yet It exists as if divided in beings. That, the Knowable, is the supporter of beings; devouring, as well as generating (them).

and impartible, It is one like ākāśa (space) in every body; *yet It exists as if divided in beings*, all living creatures, because It is so imagined (to be different) with reference to the (different) bodies only. *That, the Knowable, is the supporter of beings*, the sustainer of all beings, during the period of "sthiti" (the sustenance of the universe); *devouring* them at the time of "pralaya" (dissolution of the universe), *as well as generating* them, at the time of "utpatti" (the origin of the universe);—just as the rope (and the like) with regard to the snake (and the rest), which are imagined (on them) falsely.

80. i.e. beyond the range of the senses. (Ā)

Question:—If the Knowable, though existing everywhere, is not perceived directly, then is It mere darkness ('tamas')?

Reply:—No.

Question:—But what (is It)?

ज्योतिषामपि तज्ज्योतिस्तमसः परमुच्यते ।
ज्ञानं ज्ञेयं ज्ञानगम्यं हृदि सर्वस्य विष्ठितम् ॥ १७ ॥

Jyotiṣām-api taj-jyotis-tamasaḥ param-ucyate
Jñānam jñeyam jñāna-gamyam hṛdi sarvasya viṣṭhitam

17. The Light even of lights, It is said to be beyond darkness,—Knowledge, the One Thing to be known, the Goal of Knowledge, dwelling in the hearts of all.

It, the Knowledge, is *the Light even of liahts*, such as the sun[81]. Indeed, the light such as the sun shine only when illuminated by the Light, the Consciousness, of the Self,—according to Śruti:

"Illumined by which Light, the sun shines" (Tai.Br.III.xii.9).

"By Its light, all this shines". (Śv. VI.14; Ka. II.ii.15);

And the Smrti Gitā also, herein—"The Light residing in the sun"(XV.12), etc.

It is said to be beyond darkness, to be uncontaminated by nescience (ajñāna).

To infuse courage in him (Arjuna or any other sādhaka) who might feel dejected at the thought that Knowledge and the rest are difficult to attain, the Lord says:

81. Brahman, the Knowable, does exist as the illuminator of the sun etc., as also of the intellect (*buddhi*) etc. (Ā)

Knowledge, (i.e. the means to Knowledge) such as humility (XIII-7 to 11); *the One Thing to be known*, as stated in the passage "That which has to be known, I shall describe" etc. (XIII-12 to 17); *the Goal of Knowledge*, the Knowable Itself, which when known becomes the fruit of Knowledge and is accordingly spoken of as the Goal of Knowledge, but which as the Entity to be known is spoken of as the Knowable. These three (Knowledge, the Knowable, and the Goal of Knowledge) are *dwelling*, i.e. pre-eminently abiding, *in the hearts*, the intellect (buddhi), *of all*, of every animate being. Verily, it is only there that the three are clearly manifest.

This (following) verse sets out to conclude the topic treated of above:

इति क्षेत्रं तथा ज्ञानं ज्ञेयं चोक्तं समासतः ।
मद्भक्त एतद्विज्ञाय मद्भावायोपपद्यते ॥ १८ ॥

Iti kṣetram tathā jñānam jñeyam coktam samāsatah
Mad-bhakta etad-vijñāya mad-bhāvāyopapadyate

18. Thus *kṣetra*, as also Knowledge, and the Knowable, have been briefly stated. My devotee, on knowing this, is fitted for My state.

Thus, kṣetra, the group beginning with 'the great Elements' and ending with 'fortitude' (XIII-5-6), *as also Knowledge*, the group beginning with 'humility' and ending with 'understanding the purpose of the Knowledge of Truth' (XIII, 7-11), *and the Knowable*, described in the passage beginning with 'That which has to be known)' and ending with 'It is said to be beyond darkness' (XIII, x-17), these *have been briefly stated.* This much, indeed, is the whole of the import of the Vedas, as also of the Gītā, concisely stated.

Who is the person fit for this True (Plenary) Knowledge? The answer follows:

My devotee, he who has consigned his entire being to Me, the Supreme Lord, The Omniscient, the Supreme Teacher, Vāsudeva;—he, whose intellect (understanding, buddhi) is permeated with the all-possessing idea that all that he sees, hears, or touches, are none but the Lord Vāsudeva; he is My devotee. Such a person *on knowing this*, (that is to say) having attained the Plenary (True) Knowledge aforesaid, *is fitted for My* state, namely, abidance as the Supreme Self (paramātma-bhāva): he attains mokṣa.

In the Seventh Chapter (vv.4-5) two *Prakṛtis* of the Lord, the lower and the higher, indicating the *kṣetra* and the *Kṣetrajña*, were described. And it was stated that "all beings have their birth in these" (VII.6). It will now be explained how the *kṣetra* and the *Kṣetrajña*, the two *Prakṛtis* constitute the generating cause of (all) beings.

प्रकृतिं पुरुषं चैव विद्ध्यनादी उभावपि ।
विकारांश्च गुणांश्चैव विद्धि प्रकृतिसंभवान् ॥ १९ ॥

Prakṛtim puruṣam caiva viddhyanādī ubhāvapi
Vikārāṁśca guṇāṁścaiva viddhi prakṛti-sambhavān

19. Know that *Prakṛti* as also *Puruṣa* are both beginningless; and know that all modifications and *guṇas* are born of *Prakṛti*.

Know that Prakṛti, as also Puruṣa[82], both of which are Prakṛtis (modes) of the Lord (Īśvara), *are both beginningless*: there is no beginning for them. Since Īśvara is the eternal Lord, it is but right that His Prakṛtis also should eternally exist. Indeed, the lordship (Īśvaratva) of Īśvara consists merely in His being possessed of the two Prakṛtis, through which He becomes the cause of the origin, sustenance, and dissolution, of the universe. These two (Prakṛtis) are beginningless and are the cause of saṁsāra.

82. The lower Prakṛti of the Lord is here spoken of as Prakṛti; and the higher the *jīva* (the principle of consciousness) as *Puruṣa*. (Ā)

Some explain anādi as a tat-puruṣa samāsa[83], (na-ādi), meaning "not-cause" (origin). They hold that only by such an interpretation can Īśvara being the cause (of all) be established; and that if, on the contrary, Prakṛti and Puruṣa be eternal, the universe would be their creation, and the creator-ship of the universe will not be the Lord's.

That interpretation is not correct; for, Īśvara would then be bereft of Īśvaratva (lordship), by reason of the absence of anything to be lorded over by Him prior to the birth of Prakṛti and Puruṣa; and saṁsāra being produced without a cause[84]. there would be no deliverance therefrom; scripture (śāstra) would become purposeless, and there would be neither bondage nor release[85].

On the other hand, if the two Prakṛtis of the Lord be eternal, all this becomes logical.

How*ā*

(Thus:) *Know* also *that all modifications*, from buddhi down to the body and the organs, specified herein, *and guṇas*, which appear in their modified forms such as pleasure, pain and delusion, *are born of Prakṛti*, the Power of Īśvara, namely Mā*y*ā, composed of the three guṇas, which produces the modifications and the guṇas[86]. Know that all these modifications and guṇas are transformations of Prakṛti.

What, then, are (the characteristics of) the modifications (vikāras) and guṇas, which are born of Prakṛti? (The reply follows):

83. See note 49 Champ. X.

84. i.e. by Īśvara alone, without the two *Prakṛtis*. (Ā)

85. If *Ī*śvara were the sole cause of saṁsāra without the two *Prakṛtis*, then since *Ī*śvara would function freely of His own will, there would be nothing to prevent even emancipated souls from being thrown back into *saṁsāra*. *Moreover*, before the birth of the two *Prakṛtis*, there could be no bondage, nor the absence of it, namely *mokṣa*; and if both bondage and *mokṣa* be non-existent at any time then they could never again be brought about by the two *Prakṛtis* functioning as their cause. (Ā)

86. *Prakṛti* being eternal, and modifications and *guṇas* being its products, the conclusion is that the Ātman is without any change and without any qualities. (Ā)

कार्यकरणकर्तृत्वे हेतुः प्रकृतिरुच्यते ।
पुरुषः सुखदुःखानां भोक्तृत्वे हेतुरुच्यते ॥ २० ॥

Kārya-karaṇa-kartṛtve hetuḥ prakṛtir-ucyate
Puruṣaḥ sukha-duḥkhānām bhoktṛtve hetur-ucyate

20. In the production of the effect and the instruments, *Prakṛti* is said to be the cause; *Puruṣa* is said to be the cause in the experience of pleasure and pain.

In the production of the effect, the body, *and the instruments* the thirteen[87] which are located therein (i.e. in the body), ***Prakṛti is said to be the cause***. The (five) elements which originate the body, and the sense-objects, which have been referred to previously as the modifications of Prakṛti, are here comprehended in the term 'effect'. And all guṇas which are born of Prakṛti, such as pleasure, pain and delusion, are comprehended in the term 'instruments', because they rest in the instruments (the senses). In the production of the effect and the instrument (namely, the body, and the senses and their cognitions), Prakṛti is said to be the cause, being their originator. By thus being the producer of the effect and the instruments, Prakṛti is the cause of saṁsāra.

With regard to the reading (of the text) 'kārya-kārana-kartṛtve' (i.e., kārana instead of "karana"; "kārana" meaning "cause"), the meaning is: that which is a modification (vipariṇāma) of another is the effect (kārya) or evolute (vikāra) of the latter; and that which gets transformed (vikāri) is the cause (kārana): (and thus, the meaning is) the production of both these, (viz.,) the effect and the cause.

To give another interpretation, the sixteen evolutes (vikāras) are spoken of as the effect(s) and the seven prakṛti-vikṛtis (which

87. The five organs of knowledge, the five organs of action, manas, buddhi and ahaṁkāra. (Ā)

are at once cause as well as effect) are spoken of as the cause[88]. In the production of these, Prakṛti is said to be the cause, indeed as being their originator.

How Puruṣa also is the cause of saṁsāra will now be stated. *Puruṣa*, synonymous with jīva, Kṣetrajña and Bhoktā[89], *is said to be the cause in the experience of pleasure and pain*, with regard to the apperception of objects of enjoyment, such as pleasure and pain.

The question arises: How is it that *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa* are said to be the cause of *saṁsāra*, through thus producing the effect and instruments, and by experiencing pleasure and pain (respectively)? As to this, we say: How is saṁsāra at all possible, without the transformation of *Prakṛti* into causes and results, in the form of effects and instruments, pleasure and pain; and without the sentient *Puruṣa* functioning as their experiencer[90]? But, when there is the intimate union, in the form of nescience (*avidyā*), with the object of experience, namely *Prakṛti*—transformed into causes and results in the form of the effect and instruments, pleasure, and pain,— of its (*Prakṛti's*) opposite, the *Puruṣa* functioning as the experiencer, then (only) is *saṁsāra* possible. Wherefore, what has been stated—that *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa* are the cause of *saṁsāra*, respectively by (the former) being the producer of the effect and the instruments, and by (the latter) being the experiencer of pleasure and pain—is appropriate.

Objection:—What, then, is this *saṁsāra*, forsooth[91]?

88. (See note 50 ante). The sixteen evolutes (vikāras) are the eleven organs (ten organs and manas) and the five sense-objects. The seven *Prakṛti-Vikṛtis* are *mahat*, *ahaṁkāra*, and the five *tan-mātras*. The originator of all these is *mūla-prakṛti*. (Ā)

89. That the *Puruṣa* referred to here is not the Paramātman is indicated by the synonym *jīva* (individual soul); that being the supporter of life, he is a sentient principle (*cetana*), by the synonym *Kṣetrajña*: and that he is not dissociated from *upādhi*, by the synonym *Bhoktā*. (Ā)

90. For, indeed, the Ātman who is ever-free (*nitya-mukta*) is in Himself 'beyond' saṁsāra. (Ā)

91. Because it is not proper to say that the Ātman, who is changeless (*avikriya*), can be subject to *saṁsāra*. (Ā)

Reply:—*Saṁsāra* is the experiencing of pleasure and pain; and the *Puruṣa's* being subject to it (*saṁsāritvaṁ*) consists in his being the experiencer of pleasure and pain[92].

It has been stated that *Puruṣa's* being a *saṁsārin* consists in his being the experiencer of pleasure and pain. To what cause this (his being such experiencer) is due is being described;

पुरुषः प्रकृतिस्थो हि भुङ्क्ते प्रकृतिजान्गुणान् ।
कारणं गुणसङ्गोऽस्य सदसद्योनिजन्मसु ॥ २१ ॥

Puruṣaḥ prakṛtistho hi bhuṇgte prakṛtijān-guṇān
Kāraṇam guṇa-saṇgo(a)sya sad-asad-yoni-janmasu

21. Indeed, seated in *Prakṛti*, *Puruṣa* experiences the *guṇas* born of *Prakṛti*. Attachment to the *guṇas* is the reason for his birth in good and evil wombs.

Indeed, because, *seated in Prakṛti*, Avidyā (nescience) appearing in its modifications, the effects and the instruments,—that is to say, because of identifying himself with Prakṛti—therefore, *Puruṣa*, the experiencer, *experiences*, apprehends, *the guṇas born of Prakṛti*, and manifested in the forms of pleasure, pain and delusion. He apprehends them in the following manner: "I am happy", "I am miserable", "I am deluded", "I am learned". Apart from avidyā (nescience)[93], *the attachment to*, i.e. the identification of himself with, *the guṇas*,—pleasure, pain and delusion—, when they are experienced, is the chief cause of saṁsāra, birth, as is stated by Śruti: "As is his desire, so is his will to act"—(Bṛ.IV.iv.5). This is exactly what the Lord also says:

92. The appehension of either pleasure of pain is experience (perception), and that constitutes *saṁsāra* for the percipient (*draṣṭā*), who remains changeless. His *saṁsāritvaṁ* lies in his being the experiencer in the manner stated. (Ā)

93. which is the cause of the experience. (Ā)

Attachment to the guṇas is the reason for his, the Puruṣa's, the experiencer's, *birth in good and evil vombs*, which has to be endured.

Or, we may interpret this passage as meaning: the reason for this saṁsāra (transmigration) through birth in good and evil wombs is the attachment to the guṇas;—by supplying the word 'saṁsāra '.

Good wombs are those of devas (gods, divine beings) and the like; evil wombs are those of beasts and the like. By implication, partly good and partly evil ("sat-asat") wombs, namely the human wombs, are also to be understood, as consistent with the context.

To sum up: That which is stated as the *Puruṣa's* 'situation in *Prakṛti*'', namely *avidyā*, and 'the attachment to the *guṇas*', namely *kāma* (desire), together form the cause of *saṁsāra*[94]. This is mentioned in order that one may get rid of them. And the means for the riddance of this cause are *jñāna* (knowledge) and *vairāgya* (indifference or non-attachment), joined with *saṁnyāsa* (renunciation[95], as is conclusively taught in the *Gītā-śāstra*. This knowledge has been intially referred to as that relating to the *kṣetra* and the *Kṣetrajña* (XIII.2). And it has been reitereated in the passage beginning. "Knowing which one attains the Immortal'' (XIII.12 both by excluding what the Self is not and by attributing to the Self what do not pertain to It[96].

The same (Knowledge leading to Immortality) is again being taught directly:

उपद्रष्टाऽनुमन्ता च भर्ता भोक्ता महेश्वरः ।
परमात्मेति चाप्युक्तो देहेऽस्मिन्पुरुषः परः ॥ २२ ॥

94. *Avidyā* is the *upādāna* (material) cause, and attachment is the *nimitta* (efficient) cause; and, thus, both together constitute the cause. (Ā)

95. Where there is *vairāgya*, there is *saṁnyāsa*; and knowledge joined with *saṁnyāsa* dispels *ajñāna* together with attachment. (Ā)

96. What the Self is not is excluded by verse 12; and attributes which do not really pertain to it are ascribed to it in verses 12 et seq. (Ā)

Upadraṣṭā(a)numantā ca bhartā bhoktā Maheśvaraḥ
Paramātmeti cāpyukto dehe(a)smin-Puruṣaḥ paraḥ

22. The Looker-on and the Permitter; the Supporter, the Experiencer, the Great Lord; and also spoken of as the Supreme Self;—He (is) the Supreme *Puruṣa* in this body.

The Looker-on, one who, staying near, looks on, without himself engaging in any action. Just as when the priests and the sacrificer are engaged in the performance of a sacrifice, there is another person (upadraṣṭā), an expert in the knowledge concerning sacrifices, sitting by their side, without engaging himself in any action, but observing what is right and what is wrong in the actions of the priests and the sacrificer,—in the same way, the Self, Himself not participating in the actions of the effect and the instruments (i.e. the body and senses), and being quite distinct from them, is a near witness of the body and senses as also of their activities, and is thus the Looker-on.

Or—the body, the eye, manas, buddhi, and the Self (Ātman) are all seers; of these, the body is the external seer; proceeding from it, the innermost and inwardly nearest seer is the Self (Pratyagātman), beyond Whom there is no seer further inward; He being the nearest ("upa") seer ("draṣṭā") is referred to as upadraṣṭā." (Looker-on). Or—since he takes note of everything, like the upadraṣṭā in a sacrifice, He is called "upadraṣṭā."

And, He is also *the Permitter*; feeling satisfaction at the actions of those engaged in action, that is to say, assenting to or approving them[97]. Or, He is the Permitter, because though Himself not engaged in the activities of the body and the senses. He is conceived as if He were acting favourably towards them. Or, He is the Permitter, because when they engage themselves in their respective

97. When those performing actions of their own accord are engaged in action, the feeling of satisfaction (*paritoṣa*), on the part of another who is by their side at those actions is assent (*anumanana*); and that itself is approval (*anumodana*); and he who gives such 'approval' by his mere presence is the 'permitter' (*anumantā*). (Ā)

activities, He, standing as their (mere) witness, never prohibits or prevents them (from acting).

He is *the Supporter.* The body, senses, manas, and buddhi, which are mere appearances (or reflections—"ābhāsa") of Consciousness (Caitanya), form a close combination, as instruments to serve the purposes of someone else, namely the Conscious Self (caitanyātman); holding them in their respective forms is what is termed 'support'; ad because this support is provided by the Conscious Self Itself, the Self is said to be the Supporter.

He is *the Experiencer*[98], Just as heat (is the inherent nature) of fire, eternal awareness (nitya-caitanya) is the inherent nature (svarūpa) of the Self (Ātman). And it is through this (inherent nature) that the contents of all experiences—namely the cognitions of buddhi, in the forms of pleasure, pain and delusion, are perceived clearly in all their variety, even as they arise, as though seized by the Conscious Self. Accordingly, the Self is said to be the Experiencer.

He is *the Great Lord*, because being the Self of all and being independent, He is at once Great, as well as the Lord.

And He is *also spoken of as the Supreme Self.* It is through avidyā (nescience) that the body and the rest upto buddhi are taken for the Inner Self (Pratyagātman). The Self, who has been defined as the Looker-on etc., is superior to all of them; so He is the Supreme Self. Accordingly, He is spoken of as the Paramātman within, in the Śruti also.

Where is He? *The Supreme Puruṣa*, who is beyond the Avyakta (unmanifested) and who will be described later on, in the verse, "But another, the Supreme Purusa, called the Highest Self" (XV.17), *is in this body*).

What was introduced in the verse, "Me do you, also, know to be the *Kṣetrajña*" (XIII.2) has been explained at length, and the subject has been concluded.

98. Being an experiencer is usually associated with activity. Here, the Self is said to be Experiencer, for quite a different reason, namely, that *Cit* (pure intelligence, the Self) is the terminal ground of (all) experience. (Ā)

The following verse speaks of the person who knows the Self as described above:

य एवं वेत्ति पुरुषं प्रकृतिं च गुणैः सह ।
सर्वथा वर्तमानोऽपि न स भूयोऽभिजायते ॥ २३ ॥

Ya evam vetti puruṣam prakṛtim ca guṇaih saha
Sarvathā vartamano(a)pi na sa bhūyo(a)bhijāyate

23. He who thus knows *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* with the *guṇas*, whatever his life (mode of living), is not born again.

He who thus knows Puruṣa, in the manner described[99], directly as " He I am"; *and Prakṛti*, namely avidyā, as described above[100], *with the guṇas*, its modifications, (—it is to be understood) as effaced, reduced to a non-entity, by Knowledge (vidyā),—

Whatever his life (*mode of living*), though he may lead all sorts of life[101], *is not born again*, on the death of the body in which he has attained to Wisdom, he will not have to put on another body.

The import is: Need it be said that the Wise-man who conforms to his prescribed duties is not born again?

Objection:—Although the absence of rebirth subsequent to the dawn of Knowledge has been taught,—even then, with respect to to the actions performed before the dawn of Knowledge (in the current birth), those that might be performed thereafter, and those that had been performed in the past several births, there should be three (more) births, because it is unreasonable to presume their annihilation without yielding their results. It is indeed not permissible to presume the annihilation of these actions done—

99. i.e. as the substratum of all appearances such as the *jiva*, *Iśvara*, etc. (Ā)

100. i.e. as beginningless, as indefinable, and as causing all the *upādhis* .limitations) which are unsubstantial and produce evil (*anārtha*). (Ā)

101. i.e. whether he may be performing the prescribed duties or the prohibited actions. (Ā)

even as with respect to the actions which have begun to yield their fruit, giving rise to the current birth; and we see no distinction between the different classes of actions[102]. Therefore, the three classes of actions should give rise to three births; or all of them combined may give rise to a single birth[103]. Otherwise, by supposing that what has been done could be annihilated, there would be want of faith everywhere, and Scripture would become futile[104]. Therefore, it is not proper to say that "he is not born again".

Reply:—Not so: hundreds of *Śruti* texts, such as the following, teach that all actions of the illumined person are burnt away—

"An all his actions are annihilated" (*Mu.*II.ii.9);

"He who knows Brahman becomes Brahman Itself, (*Mu.* III.ii.9);

"For him there is delay only so long (as he is not released from the body)" (*Ch.* VI.xiv. 2);

"All his actions are burnt away, like the tuft of the *Iṣikā* reed (thrown into the fire)" (*Ch.*V.xxiv.3).

Here (in the *Gītā*) also, the burning away of all actions has been taught in the passage, "As blazing fire reduces wood to

102. All actions (*karmas*), being the products of *ajñāna*,fare equally opposed to Knowledge; therefore it is no use making a distinction on the ground that some actions have already begun to yield their fruit, whereas the others have not. (Ā) Usually it is held that only that portion of *karma* which is called "*Prārabdha*", viz., the *karma* that has already commenced giving fruits in the current birth, continues to run its entire course, even after the down of Knowledge; and that the heap of *karma* done after the dawn of Knowledge, called "*Āgāmi*", and the accumulation of such of those *karmas* of the past several births as have not come into force in the current birth, and called "*Sañcita*", are annihilated at the dawn of Knowledge.

103. All the three classes of actions, being those which have not begun to yield their fruits, can be considered as the of the same variety. (Ā)

104. 'What of faith' is 'indecision' as to whether action would yield fruit; everywhere' includes even actions which have begun to operate; 'futility of Scripture' (i.e. of the *karma-kāṇḍa*), because actions prescribed by Scripture will not give rise to the (future) birth (in which to enjoy the promised fruit). (Ā)

ashes'' etc. (IV.37); and will again be taught later on[105]. And this stands to reason as well; for, only such acts as are caused by the seeds of evil such as ignorance (*avidyā*), desire (*kāma*), etc. bring about future births[106]. Here (in the *Gītā*) also, the Lord has here and there stated that those actions (alone) performed with egoism and the desire (for fruit) bring about results, but not others. Elsewhere also it is stated:

"Just as seeds burnt by fire do not sprout again, so also a body cannot be brought about again by afflictions (*kleśa*) burnt away by Wisdom''. (*M.B.*, *Vana*, 200-110).

Objection:—Let it then be that actions performed subsequent to the dawn of Knowledge are burnt away by wisdom, since they are accompanied with Knowledge[107]. But, it is not proper to hold that actions performed in this birth before the dawn of Knowledge and those performed in the past several births are burnt away.

Reply:—Not so, because of the adjective (in) "*all* (*sarva*) actions '' (IV.37).

Objection:—That may mean only 'all actions' performed after the attainment of Knowledge.

Reply:—No; because there is no justification for such a restriction (of the meaning).

And, as to what was contended, namely, that in the same way as actions which have brought about the present body,—i.e.

105. The instruction to 'relinquish all dharmas' (XVIII 66) shows that Knowledge burns away all actions. (Ā)

106. For the un-illumined, the *kleśas*, viz., *avidya*, *asmita*, *raga*, *devesa*, and *abhinivesa* (vide note 12 in Chap. VIII), constitute the seeds of all evil. Whatever acts of *dharma* and *adharma* are occasioned by them, all such acts bring about future birth. But the actions of the illumined person, for whom the seeds of *kleśa* have been burnt by Wisdom, have merely the semblance (*pratibhāsa*) of the form of activity; and they cannot bring about a body, since they have lost the capacity to function effectively, even as a cloth which has been burnt. (Ā)

107. since such actions are, even at the moment of their origin, devoured by their enemy (Knowledge). (Ā)

those which have already proceeded to yield fruit do not get destroyed, even though Knowledge is present, so also even those actions which have not commenced to produce their results cannot get destroyed, (we say) that is wrong. How? The former have begun their effect, like a discharged arrow. Just as an arrow, once discharged from a bow for piercing a target, does not cease to act, even after having pierced the target, until it falls down after the exhaustion of the initial energy, so also the actions which have brought about the body continue to act as before till the exhaustion of the impetus of their influence (*saṁskāra*)[108], even after their purpose, the conditioning of a body, has been accomplished. But the same arrow, even though fixed to the bow, can be withdrawn when it has not been discharged, that is, not started with the impetus needed for its propulsion. In the same way, actions which have not yet begun their effects are rendered infertile by Knowledge, even as they remain in their own resting place[109]. Thus, it is established that it has been rightly said that on the falling of the (present) body of the illumined person, 'he is not born again'.

Now, the various means to Self-perception—namely, meditation and the rest—are being stated[110].

ध्यानेनात्मनि पश्यन्ति केचिदात्मानमात्मना ।
अन्ये सांख्येन योगेन कर्मयोगेन चापरे ॥ २४ ॥

Dhyānenātmani paśyanti kecid ātmānam-ātmanā
Anye sāṁkhyena yogena karma-yogena cāpare

108. The arrow released from a bow will not fall on the way (to the target) in the absence of a sufficiently strong impediment. In the same way, actions which have commenced to yield their fruit do not get destroyed except by the enjoyment of the fruit, in the absence of a sufficiently strong impediment. And, Self-knowledge is not such an impediment, since at its very origin its power is hindered by the *karma* which has already commenced to operate. (Ā)

109. The resting place is the inner-sense having the semblance of Consciousness (*sābhāsa-antaḥ-karaṇa*). (Ā)

110. according to the aspirant (*sādhaka*)'s fitness and qualifications (*adhikāra*). (Ā)

24. By meditation some behold the Self in the self by the self, others by *Sāṁkya-yoga*, and others by *Karma-yoga*.

By meditation: Through concentration:—withdrawing the senses of hearing etc. from their objects, namely, sound and the rest, into the mind (manas), and then withdrawing the mind into the Inner Cogniser; and (then) contemplating (the Inner Cogniser) with one-pointedness is said to be meditation. It is thus:—from the mention of the comparisons, "the crane meditates as it were" "the earth meditates as it were, the mountains meditate as it were" (Ch. VII.vi.1), 'meditation' is the cognition (the awareness) which is continuous and unbroken as a line of descending oil. By such meditation, *some* yogins[111], *behold the Self*, the Inner Consciousness, *in the self*, buddhi, *by the self*, the inner-sense (antaḥ-karaṇa) refined by meditation (dhyāna).

others by Sāṁkhya-yoga: Contemplation in the following manner is Sāṁkhya: "These gunas, sattva, rajas, and tamas, are objects perceived by me; I am different from them being the witness of their acts, the eternal Self distinct from the guṇas". This is Sāṁkhya-yoga[112]; and by it some[113] behold the Self (in the self) by the self.

and others by Karma-yoga. Karma itself is Yoga; action performed with the feeling of dedication to the Lord (Īśvara) is figuratively said to be Yoga, as it leads to Yoga[114]. Some[115]

111. These are the highest class of aspirants (*uttama-adhikārins*) who, conforming to meditation, behold the Self to be the same as the Paramātman. (Ā)

112. Sāṁkya is knowledge arising through the exercise of reason (*vicāra*); that knowledge, being the means to Yoga, is of the same class and is (figuratively) spoken of as Yoga. (Ā). Here *Sāṁkhya-yoga* stands for one of the six *darśanas* and not for the Path of Knowledge (Jñāna) as in Chap. II etc.,

113. These are aspirants of the middle class (*madhyama-adhikārins*). (Ā)

114. Concentration of mind is Yoga; and *karma* by causing purity (of the mind) leads to it. (Ā)

115. These are the inferior class of aspirants. (Ā)

behold (the Self) by this (Yoga), which by purifying the mind gives rise to Knowledge.

अन्ये त्वेवमजानन्तः श्रुत्वाऽन्येभ्य उपासते ।
तेऽपि चातितरन्त्येव मृत्युं श्रुतिपरायणाः ॥ २५ ॥

Anye tvevam-ajānantaḥ śrutvā(a)nyebhya upāsate
Te(a)pi cātitarantyeva mṛtyum śruti-parāyanāḥ

25. Others again, not knowing thus, worship, having heard from others. Even they do cross beyond death, by being solely devoted to what they have heard.

Others again[116], *not knowing* the Self spoken of, *thus*, even by any one of the several alternative methods pointed out, *worship, having heard from others*: Having been told by spiritual teachers (acāryas) "meditate upon this thus", they contemplate with faith (śraddhā) on it. *Even they do cross beyond death*, go beyond saṁsāra which is bound with death, *by being solely devoted* to *what they have heard*: in setting out on the path to mokṣa, their best help is what they have heard; they depend solely on the instruction of others as their authority, being incapable of discerning for themselves.

The import is that it needs no saying that the intelligent who can independently decide about the means of getting Knowledge do cross beyond death.

The knowledge concerning the identity of the *Kṣetrajña* with Īśvara, referred to in the words "Me do you also know to be the *Kṣetrajña* (XIII.2), has been spoken of as the means to *mokṣa*,— "knowing which one attains to the Immortal" (XIII.12). For what reason is it so? The reason is explained in the following verse:

116. This is how the lowest class of aspirants proceed on the path to *mokṣa*. (Ā)

यावत्संजायते किंचित्सत्त्वं स्थावरजङ्गमम् ।
क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञसंयोगात्तद्विद्धि भरतर्षभ ॥ २६ ॥

Yāvat-saṁjāyate kiñcit-sattvam sthāvara-jaṅgamam
Kṣetra-kṣetrajña-saṁyogāt-tad-viddhi Bharatarṣabha

26. Whatever being is born, the un-moving or the moving, O best of the Bhāratas, know it to be from the union of the *kṣetra* and the *Keṣtrajña*[117].

Whatever being, object that has existence ("vastu'),' *is born,* is produced;—

Is the reference here to mere existence as an object, without any distinction? As to this, the Lord says: whatever, *the unmoving or the moving* being is born, *know it to be*, understand that it is born, *from the union of the keṣtra and the Kṣetrajña, O best of the Bhāratas*!

Objection:—What is it that is meant by 'the union of the *kṣetra* and the *Kṣetrajña*?, The union of the *Kṣetrajña* with the *kṣetra* cannot indeed be a relation of the kind brought about by the mutual contact of each other's parts, as in the case of a rope with a pot, because the *Kṣetrajña* is without parts, like *ākāśa* (space). Nor can it be of the nature of *samavāya* (inseparable inherence), as is the case with threads ānd cloth; for, mutual relationship as effect and cause cannot be admitted with respect to the *kṣetra* and the *Kṣetrajña*.

Reply:—The union of the *kṣetra* and the *Kṣetrajña*, which are mutually opposed in their nature, being (respectively) the

117. Because every being is born from the connection of the *kṣetra* and the *Kṣetrajña*, therefore no being does exist apart from the Supreme Self who is identical with the *Kṣetrajña*; and hence the knowledge of the identity (of the *Kšetrajña* with the Supreme Self) can alone lead to *mokṣa*—this is the import of this verse (Ā)

object and the subject, is of the nature of mutual *adhyāsa* (superimposition), consisting in confounding the one with the other as also the attributes of the one with those of the other, brought about by the absence of discrimination of the real nature of the *kṣetra* and the *Kṣetrajña.* It is like the union of the rope and the mother-of-pearl, respectively with the serpent and the silver, which are super-imposed on them, due to the absence of discrimination of their real nature [as when a rope lying in darkness is mistaken for a serpent, and a mother-of-pearl shining in sunlight is mistaken for a silver piece]. And this union of the *kṣetra* and the *Kṣetrajña*, which is of the nature of *adhyāsa*, is false knowledge (*mithyā-jñāna*). He, who understanding the characteristic difference between the *kṣetra* and the *Kṣetrajña* in conformity with Scripture (*Śāstra*), separates the *Kṣetrajña* of the nature already stated[118] from the *kṣetra* whose form (also) has been already described[119] like separating the *iṣikā*-reed from the *muñja*-grass—and realises the Knowlable, devoid of all specific attributes as described in the words, "It is not said to be '*sat*' or, *asat*'"(XIII.12) Brahman, as It is (as his own Self)—having at the same time the, settled wisdom that the *kṣetra*, which is in fact non-existent, merely appears as if existent, just like an elephant produced by the illusion of magic, an object seen in a dream, and the *gandharva-nagara* (phantom-city seen in the sky'[120]— for him, that false knowledge disappears, through the contrariness of the Right (Plenary) Knowledge spoken of. And, because the cause of (another) birth vanishes for such a person, the statement made—that the man of wisdom "who thus knows *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* with the *guṇas* is not born again" (XIII.23)—has been truly said.

In the words, "he is not born again" (XIII.23), it has been declared that the fruit of Right (Plenary) Knowledge is the cessation of births through the abolition of the seed of *saṁsāra*, namely, *avidyā* and the like[121]. And, the cause of birth has been stated,

118., 119. The nature of the *Kṣetrajña* has been stated in verse 22; and the form of the *kṣetra* in verses 5 and 6. (Ā)

120. The mention of several illustrations indicates that the *kṣetra* appears in various modes. (Ā)

121. 'and the like 'refers to the effects (*saṁskāras*) of *avidyā* or false knowledge (*mithyā-jñāna*). (Ā)

namely, the "union of *kṣetra* and *Kṣetrajña*", which is effected through *avidyā*. Hence, Right Knowledge, which removes the said *avidyā*, though already spoken of, is again being described in different words.:

समं सर्वेषु भूतेषु तिष्ठन्तं परमेश्वरम् ।
विनश्यत्स्वविनश्यन्तं यः पश्यति स पश्यति ॥ २७ ॥

Samam sarveṣu bhūteṣu tiṣṭhantam Parameśvaram
Vinaśyatsvavinaśyantam yah paśyati sa paśyati

27. The Supreme Lord, existing equally in all beings, the deathless amidst the dying,—(Him), who sees, he (alone) doth see.

The Supreme Lord, existing, abiding, *equally*, without any difference; where?—*in all beings*, in all living creatures, from Brahmā down to an un-moving object (sthāvara). He is the Lord Supreme, with reference to the body, senses, manas, buddhi, the avyakta[122], and the individual soul (jivātman). All living beings are (here) characterised (by the Lord) as '*dying*' and the Supreme Lord is distinguished *as the deathless*, in order to bring out the extreme disparity between the beings and the Supreme Lord. How is that? Of all the changing states[123] of being, that (state) named as 'birth' is the root, and all the other changes of state, terminating in 'death', arise after 'birth'. There is no change of state beyond 'death', for the object itself does not (then) exist; as only when the substance (dharmin, possessor of dharmas) is present, can attributes (dharmas) exist. Therefore, by the mention of the denial of the final change of state, all antecedent changes of state, with their effects, stand denied. Thus, the extreme dissimiliarity of the Supreme Lord from all beings, as also His immutability and One-ness (being without a second), are settled. He, *who sees* the Supreme Lord thus, as described, *he* alone *doth see*.

122. the un-manifested i.e., the *kāraṇa-śarīra* (causal body), *avidyā*.

123. vide note 34, Ch. II.

Objection:—The entire world sees[124]; why this discrimination.?

Reply:—True, it (the world) sees, but sees wrongly; and hence the Lord particularises that he (the person described) alone sees. For example, a man whose eye-sight is affected by the disease of 'timira' sees many a moon; and, with reference to him, he who sees a single moon is characterised as the person who alone sees (correctly). In the same way, here also, he who sees the One undivided Self as stated above is distinguished from those who wrongly see many separate selves, in the words, "he alone sees". Others even though seeing, do not see (truly), since they see wrongly, like him who sees many moons.

It is necessary to extol the Right (Plenary) Knowledge mentioned above, by stating its fruit[125]. The next verse proceeds accordingly:

समं पश्यन्हि सर्वत्र समवस्थितमीश्वरम् ।
न हिनस्त्यात्मनात्मानं ततो याति परां गतिम् ॥ २८ ॥

Samam paśyam-hi sarvatra samavasthitam-Īśvaram
Na hinastyātmanā(ā)tmānam tato yāti parām gatim

28. Since, seeing the Lord equally existent everywhere, he injures not the self by the self, therefore he reaches the Supreme Goal.

Since, because, *seeing*, directly realising, *the Lord* described in the immediately preceeding verse, *equally existing*, abiding in the same mānner (without distinction) *everywhere*, in all beings—

What happens when one has this realisation?

124. i.e. perceives with the eye.

125. in order to prompt men to resort to it (Ā)

He injures not, destroys, not, *the self by the self*, his own self by himself; and therefore, by that non-injury (to his own self), *he reaches the Supreme*, the highest, *Goal*, namely mokṣa.[126]

Objection:—Surely, no living creature whatever destroys itself by itself; why then the denial of self-destruction, which is an impossibility, like the prohibition, "fire should be consecrated not on earth, not in the sky, not in the heavens" (*Tai. Sam.* V.ii.7.1)?[127]

Reply:—There is nothing to find fault with here; for, disregarding the Self is demonstrable in the case of the ignorant. Indeed every ignorant man disregards the Self—Who is very much manifest, self-evident, and directly cognisable—and grasps the not-self (body etc.) as himself; and performing good and evil actions (*dharma* and *adharma*) he kills even that body which had been taken as the self, and assumes another new self (body); killing that also in like manner, he takes on another (self, body); even that also he kills in the same manner and takes on another self (body); thus killing every one which he had accepted as self, every un-enlightened person is verily a slayer of the self. And even the true Self (*Paramārtha-ātman*') is, as it were, slain, for ever through ignorance (*avidyā*), since there is no visible effect (of His presence having been felt). Thus, all un-enlightened persons are merely slayers of the self. On the contrary, that person, who sees the Self as described above, does not slay the self by the self in either manner[128]; and therefore he reaches the Supreme Goal—that is to say, the fruit spoken of (*mokṣa*) becomes his.

126. By the destruction of *ajñāna* (nescience) by True Knowledge, all evil is, at the same time, destroyed. And when the two veils (*āvaraṇas*), namely *ajñāna* and *mithyā-jñāna* (false knowledge) ,which conceal the true nature of the Self disappear, the man of illumination attains the supreme Goal, i.e. experiences the highest end of man (*parama-puruṣārtha*), the supreme bliss (*paramānanda*). (Ā)

127. The prohibition of the construction of an altar on earth has meaning, since one could be constructed on earth. But, since it is not possible to construct altars in the sky or in heaven, the prohibition relating to them should not be understood in its primary (literal) sense. So also, here, we canno t take the denial as intelligible. (Ā)

128. i.e. neither by regarding the non-self as his Self, nor by ignoring the true Self. (Ā)

What was stated—seeing the Lord equally existent in all beings, one does not injure the self by the self—seems unreasonable, because there are (diverse) selves, which are differentiated (from one another, in different bodies) by differences due to the disparity in their respective qualities and actions[129]. As to this, the Lord says:

प्रकृत्यैव च कर्माणि क्रियमाणानि सर्वशः।
यः पश्यति तथात्मानमकर्तारं स पश्यति ॥ २९ ॥

Prakṛtyaiva ca karmāṇi kriyamāṇāni sarvaśaḥ
Yah paśyati tathā(ā)tmanam-akartāram sa paśyati

29. And he sees, who sees all actions being performed by *Prakṛti* alone everywhere, and the Self the non-doer.

And he sees: he is the seer of the Supreme Truth, *who sees*, realises, that *all actions*, activities of all sorts, are *being performed by Prakṛti*, the Māyā of the Lord, comprised of the three guṇas, according to the Mantra: "One should understand that Māyā is the Prakṛti (and that the Maheśvara is the possessor of Māyā)" (Śv.IV.10). By that Prakṛti *alone*,—and not by any other[130],—which transforms itself into the forms, from "mahat" down to the effect (body) and the instruments (senses)—are all actions, vocal, mental, physical executed *everywhere*, in all ways. *And*, (he also realises that) *the Self*, the Kṣetrajña, is *the non-doer*, devoid of all attributes (upādhis).

The import is this: wtith respect to the non-doer (Self) who is bereft of *guṇas*, and devoid of distinctions, like the *ākāśa*, there can be no evidence to assume any variety (duality).

The Lord once more expounds the very same Plenary Knowledge in different words.[131]

129. Qualities: being happy, unhappy etc. Actions: good and evil deeds. (Ā)

130. The reference is to the *Pradhāna*, the *Prakṛti* of the Sāṁkhyas. (Ā)

131. In order to dispel the supposition that *Prakṛti* and its modification are absolutely distinct from the *Puruṣa*, as held by the Sāṁkhyas. (Ā)

यदा भूतपृथग्भावमेकस्थमनुपश्यति ।
तत एव च विस्तारं ब्रह्म संपद्यते तदा ॥ ३० ॥

Yadā bhūta-pṛthag-bhāvam-ekastham-anupaśyati
Tata eva ca vistāram Brahma sampadyate tadā

30. When he sees the separate existence of (all) beings as inherent in the One, and their expansion from That (One) alone, he then attains to Brahman.

When, at what moment, *he sees*, by contemplation in accordance with the teachings of Scripture (śāstra) and the Teacher (ācārya), *the separate existence of (all) beings, as inherent in the One*, as resting in the One, the Self; that is, realises by Self-intuition that, "all this is the Self alone" (Ch. VIII.xxv.2')[132], *and* when he further sees *their expansion*, origin, evolution, *from That* One *alone*[133], in the manner described (in Śruti): "From the Self, life; from the Self, desire; from the Self, remembrance; from the Self, ākāśa; from the Self, waters; from the Self, manifestation and disappearance; from the Self, food" (Ch.VII.xxvi.1', *he then*, at that very moment, *attains to Brahman*, he becomes Brahman indeed[134].

The One Self, through being the Self of all bodies, must get affected by their defects: as to this (doubt), it is stated—

अनादित्वान्निर्गुणत्वात्परमात्माऽयमव्ययः ।
शरीरस्थोऽपि कौन्तेय न करोति न लिप्यते ॥ ३१ ॥

132. He sees the variety of beings and modifications as merged (dissolved) in the Self together with *Prakṛit*; for, it is not possible to merge the variety of beings in the pure Self, when *Prakṛti* remains un-merged in the Self. (Ā)

133. Realising that the universe, from *Prakṛti* down to the ultimate particulars (*viśeṣas*), has derived its being from the all-perfect Self, he sees its essential unity with the Self. (Ā)

134. He manifests Himself in his Perfection, since all causes of limitation have been completely reduced to (unity in) the Self. And this *mokṣa* is simultaneous with the realisation spoken of. (Ā)

Anāditvān-nirguṇatvāt-paramātmā(a)yam-avyayaḥ
Śarīrastho(a)pi Kaunteya na karoti na lipyate

31. Being without beginning, and devoid of *guṇas*, this Supreme Self, immutable, though existing in the body, O son of Kuntī, neither acts nor is tainted.

Being without beginning: (the Self) has no beginning, no cause. That which has a cause undergoes destruction of itself (of its own form); but This (the Self) does not perish, because, as being without cause, He is devoid of parts. Moreover, being *devoid of guṇas*, This (the Self) foes not perish (deteriorate); for, only that which has qualities (guṇas) perishes (deteriorates) owing to the loss of its qualities. Thus, *this Supreme Self* is *immutable*, is not subject to destruction (change). Wherefore it is so, therefore, *though existing in the body*, because the Self is perceived as located in bodies, He is said to exist in the body,—yet, He *neither acts*; and because He does not act, *nor is He tainted*, affected by the fruit (of action).

Objection:—Who is it, then, in the bodies, who acts and is affected? In case there is an embodied being,—different from the Supreme Self—, who acts and gets tainted, then the identity of the *Kṣetrajña* with Isvara, referred to in passages such as "Me do you, also, know to be the *Kṣetrajña*" (XIII.2), would be unjustifiable. If, on the other hand, there be no embodied being distinct from the Īśvara, you have to say who it is that acts and gets tainted; or you have to admit that the Īśvara is not the Supreme[135]. Because the doctrine of the Upaniṣads taught by the Lord is thus, in every way, hard to understand and difficult to explain, it has (been abandoned by the Vaiśeṣikas, the Saṁkhyas, the Ārhatas Jainas) and the Buddhists.

Reply:—As to this objection, the Lord Himself has given the reply: "But it is Nature that acts" (V.14)[136]. The common talk

135. If Īśvara be the agent and the enjoyer, He cannot be the Īśvara, any more than ourselves. (Ā)

136. The Lord's teaching must be accepted as true, because agency and enjoyment are falsely ascribed through *avidyā* to the Supreme who is in reality the non-doer and non-enjoyer. (Ā)

prevalent in the work-a-day wordl, namely, "he acts, he is tainted" is nothing but the natural result of ignorance (avidyā); it cannot, in truth, apply with reference to the One, the Supreme Self. For this very reason, it has been shown by the Lord, here and there, that for the Saṁnyasins of the highest order (Paramahaṁsa-Parivrajākas), who are firmly established in this doctrine of Supreme Knowledge (paramārtha-sākṁhya) and are devoted to the path of Knowledge, and have discarded all wordly commerce which is the product of ingorance (avidyā), there is no need for the performance of karma.

Like what does He (the Self) not act and is not tainted? The Lord gives an example:

यथा सर्वगतं सौक्ष्म्यादाकाशं नोपलिप्यते ।
सर्वत्रावस्थितो देहे तथाऽऽत्मा नोपलिप्यते ॥ ३२ ॥

Yathā sarva-gatam saukṣmyād-ākāśam nopalipyate
Sarvatrāvasthito dehe tathā(ā)tmā nopalipyate

32. As the all-pervading ākāśa, because of its subtlety, is not tainted, so is the Self, existent in the body everywhere, not tainted.

As the all-pervading ākāśa, though present everywhere, *because of its subtlety*, innate property of penetration, *is not tainted*, does not get attached[137], *so* also *is the Self, existent in the body everywhere, not tainted.*

Moreover,[138]

यथा प्रकाशयत्येकः कृत्स्नं लोकमिमं रविः ।
क्षेत्रं क्षेत्री तथा कृत्स्नं प्रकाशयति भारत ॥ ३३ ॥

137. Because the ākāśa is so subtle that it permeates everything without obstruction, it does not get affected by mire and the like. (Ā)

138. The Lord now states the reason, that, being the cogniser, the Self cannot have the attributes of the cognised. (Ā)

Yathā prakāśayatyekaḥ kṛtsnam lokam-imam
raviḥ
Kṣetram kṣetrī tathā kṛtsnam prakāśayati Bhārata

33. As the one Sun illumines this entire world, so does he who abides in the *kṣetra*, O Bhārata, ilumine the whole *kṣetra*.

O Bhārata, as the one Sun, (called) Savitā, (and) Āditya (meaning, respectively, "generator" and "son of Aditi"), *illumines* makes manifest, *this entire world, so,* in the same manner, *does He who abides in the kṣetra,* the Supreme Self, who is the One *illumine the whole kṣetra,* the entire field, from the great Elements down to fortitude (XIII-5, 6).

The analogy of the Sun applies to the Self in two senses: like the (one) Sun, (reflected in the various reservoirs), the Self is one in all bodies; and (like the Sun) He is untainted.

The following verse proceeds to conclude the teaching of the whole chapter:

क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञयोरेवमन्तरं ज्ञानचक्षुषा ।
भूतप्रकृतिमोक्षं च ये विदुर्यान्ति ते परम् ॥ ३४ ॥

Kṣetra-kṣetrajñayor-evam-antaram jñāna-cakṣuṣā
Bhūta-prakṛti-mokṣam ca ye vidur-yānti te param

34. They who thus, with the eye of Knowledge, perceive the distinction between the *kṣetra* and the *Kṣetrajña*, and also the abandoning of the *Prakṛti* of beings,—they go to the Supreme.

They who, thus, in the manner explained, *with the eye of Knowledge,* the knowledge that assures (the direct realisation of) the Self, generated by the teaching of Scripture and the Teacher (ācārya), *perceive,* understand, *the distinction,* the points of mutual

difference[139], *between the kṣetra and the Kṣetrajña*, exactly as narrated, *and also the abandoning*, reduction to a nullity, *of the Prakṛti of beings*, the material cause of beings, known as Avyakta, of the form of Avidyā,—*they go to the Supreme*, the Supreme Reality, Brahman: they do not take a body again.

इति श्रीमहाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्यां
भीष्मपर्वणि श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु
ब्रह्मविद्यायां योगशास्त्रे श्रीकृष्णार्जुन-
संवादे प्रकृतिपुरुषविवेकयोगो नाम
त्रयोदशोऽध्यायः ॥

Iti Śrī Mahābhārate śata-sāhasryām saṁhitāyām Vaiyāsikyām Bhīṣma-Parvaṇi Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītāsūpaniṣatṣu Brahma-vidyāyām yoga śāstre Śrī Kṛṣṇārjuna saṁvāde Prakṛti-puruṣa-viveka-yogo nāma trayodaśo(a)dhyāyaḥ

Thus the thirteenth chapter entitled "Way of Discriminating Matter and Spirit,'[140] in the Upaniṣads known as 'The Celebrated Songs of the Lord' expounding the Knowledge of the Supreme Spirit and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna—embodied in the Bhīṣma-Parva of Śrī Mahābhārata, the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyāsa.

139. The unchangeable nature etc. of the one, (*Kṣetrajña*), and the mutability etc. of the other (*kṣetra*). (Ā)

140. This chapter is entitled *Kṣetra-Kṣetrajña Yoga* ("Knowledge concerning the Field and Knower of the Field" (in the Commentary.

॥ चदुर्दशोऽध्यायः ॥

(गुणत्रयविभागयोगः)

CATURDAŚO(A)DHYĀYAḤ

(GUṆA–TRAYA–VIBHĀGA–YOGAḤ)

CHAPTER - XIV

(THE WAY OF DISCRIMINATING THE THREE GUṆAS[1])

It has been stated that all that has birth is produced by the union of the *kṣetra* and the *Kṣetrajña* (XIII.26). How does it happen? To explain this, the (present) chapter is begun.

Or, (the chapter is begun) for showing that the *kṣetra* and the *Kṣetrajña*, both dependent on *Īśvara*—not independent in themselves as held by the Sāṃkhyas—, form the cause of the universe. It has (also) been stated that the dwelling (of the *Puruṣa*) in *Prakṛti* and (his) attachment to the *Guṇas* is the cause of (his) *saṁsāra* (XIII.21). In what *Guṇas* and in what manner is that attachment? And what are the *Guṇas*? And how do they bind (him)? In what manner is release from the *Guṇas* to be secured? What are the characteristics of the liberated person?—With a view to answering these questions also (the chapter is begun by the Lord).

श्री भगवानुवाच —

परं भूयः प्रवक्ष्यामि ज्ञानानां ज्ञानमुत्तमम् ।
यज्ज्ञात्वा मुनयः सर्वे परां सिद्धिमितो गताः ॥ १ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Param byūyaḥ pravakṣyāmi jñānānām jñānam-uttamam
Yaj-jñātva munayaḥ sarve parām siddhim-ito gatāḥ

1. the three constituents of nature (*Prakṛti*), which are the three properties belonging to all created things, viz., *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, explained in this chapter.

The Blessed Lord said—

1. Again shall I tell you that supreme Knowledge which is above all knowledge, having known which all the *Munis* (Sages) have passed to high perfection from here.

Again, although told more than once in all the preceding chapters, *shall I tell you that supreme Knowledge*,—supreme, because it relates to the Supreme Being,—*which is above all knowledge*, because it is productive of the most excellent result. 'All knowledge' does not 'here' refer to 'humility' and the rest (XIII.7 to 11)[2], but to the kowledge about things which could be known, such as sacrifices. These (latter) are of no avail for liberation (mokṣa); but this (the supreme Knowledge) leads to mokṣa. Therefore, the Lord extols it by the attributes 'supreme' and 'above all knowledge', with a view to arousing interest in the mind of the hearer.

Having known which, attained to which, *all the Munis*, saṁnyāsins who are devoted to meditation (manana), *have passed*, attained, *to high perfection*, known as liberation (mokṣa), *from here*, after being freed from this bondage of the body.

The Lord now declares that this perfection is absolute (invariable):

इदं ज्ञानमुपाश्रित्य मम साधर्म्यमागताः ।
सर्गेऽपि नोपजायन्ते प्रलये न व्यथन्ति च ॥ २ ॥

Idam jñānam-upāśritya mama sādharmyam-āgatāḥ
Sarge(a)pi nopajāyante pralaye na vyatyanti ca

2. Abiding by this Knowledge, (and thereby) having attained to My sameness, neither do they come forth in evolution, nor are they troubled in involution.

2. since the supreme Kowledge is attainable through the practice of those virtues, which have been spoken of as knowledge. (Ā)

Abiding by this Knowledge, having practised the means leading to the attainment of this knowledge being spoken of; *having attained to My sameness*, My Being, i.e. identity with Myself, Parameśvara (the Supreme Lord): 'sameness' does not just mean 'likeness' or having the same attributes; for, the Gītā-śastra does not countenance any distinction between the Kṣetrajña and Īśvara.

This mention of the fruit (of supreme Knowledge) is for the sake of extolling (that Knowledge)[3].

They, (those who have attained to My Being) *neither do come forth*, are born, *in evolution* at the time of Creation, *nor are they troubled*, disturbed, destroyed, *in involution*, at the time of Pralaya, the time of dissolution of even Brahmā.

The Lord now explains what sort of union of the *ksetra* and the *Kṣetrajña* constitutes the cause of all beings:

मम योनिर्महद्ब्रह्म तस्मिन्गर्भं दधाम्यहम् ।
संभवः सर्वभूतानां ततो भवति भारत ॥ ३ ॥

Mama yonir-mahad-Brahma tasmin-garbham dadhāmyaham
Sambhavaḥ sarva-bhūtānām tato bhavati Bhārata

3. My womb is the great Brahman; in that I place the germ; from that, O Bhārata, is the birth of all beings.

My womb, My own Māyā, which belongs to Me, made up of the three guṇas, the material cause of all beings (viz.,) Prakṛti; it *is great*, because it is greater than all effects, and it is spoken of as *Brahman*, because it bears and nourishes all its modifications; the womb itself is thus qualified.

3. 'Likeness' could not have been intended here, for the Lord is here mentioning the fruit of Knowledge; and 'likeness' is the fruit of *dhyāna*, and not that of Knowledge. (Ā)

In that womb, the great Brahman, *I place the germ*, the seed of the birth of Hiraṇya-garbha, the seed which is the cause of the birth of all beings. I am Īśvara, who possesses the two capacities (śaktis), the two prakṛtis (modes), namely the kṣetra and the Keṣtrajña; and I unite the Kṣetrajña,—who follows the nature of the upādhis, namely avidyā (nescience), kāma (desire), and karman (action),—with the kṣetra,

From that act of impregnation, *O Bhārata, is the birth of all beings*: the birth of all beings arises through the birth of the Hiraṇyagarbha.

सर्वयोनिषु कौन्तेय मूर्तयः संभवन्ति याः ।
तासां ब्रह्म महद्योनिरहं बीजप्रदः पिता ॥ ४ ॥

Sarva-yoniṣu Kaunteya mūrtayaḥ sambhavanti yāḥ
Tāsām Brahma mahad-yonir-aham bīja-pradaḥ pitā

4. Whatever forms are produced, O son of Kuntī, in all the wombs, of them the great Brahman is the womb and I the seed-giving Father.

O son of Kuntī, whatever forms, namely bodies which are aggregates fully supplied with parts and limbs, *are produced, in all the wombs*, such as those of the devas, the pitṛs, men, cattle, and (other) animals, *of them*, those forms, *the great Brahman*, which exists in all forms (modes), *is the womb*, cause; *and I*, the Īśvara, am *the seed-giving Father*, the doer of the act of impregnation.

What are the *Guṇas*? How do they bind?—The answer follows:

सत्त्वं रजस्तम इति गुणाः प्रकृतिसंभवाः ।
निबध्नन्ति महाबाहो देहे देहिनमव्ययम् ॥ ५ ॥

Sattvam rajas-tama iti guṇāḥ prakṛti-saṁbhavāḥ
Nibadhnanti mahābāho dehe dehinam-avyayam

5. O mighty-armed! *Sattva*, *Rajas*, *Tamas*—these *Guṇas*, born of *Prakṛti*, bind fast, the indestructible soul (embodied being) in the body.

Sattva, *Rajas*, *Tamas* are the names of the *Guṇas*. 'Guna' is a technical term. These guṇas do not inhere in any substance, in the way form etc. do; and no distinction of "guṇa" and "guṇin' (the attribute and the substance having that attribute) is meant here[4]. Therefore, (the guṇas are so called, because) they are, even as the guṇas (qualities, attributes of substances) ever dependant on another, namely, the Kṣetrajña, being themselves mere forms of avidyā (nescience); and they bind fast as it were the Kṣetrajña; they are spoken of as binding him, since they become capable of manifesting their peculiarities only by making him the support (of their existence).

And, being, *born of Prakṛti*, the Lord's *Māyā*, they *bind fast* as it were[5], *the embodied being*[6], *the indestructible*[7] *in the body* The indestructibility of the (Soul, i.e.) Self has (already) been declared in the verse, "Being without beginning" etc. (XIII-31).

Mighty-armed (Arjuna), he whose arms are extra-powerful and reach down to the knees.

Objection: It has been declared that the embodied being is not tainted (XIII-31). How is it then said here what is contrary—that the Guṇas bind him?

Reply:—The objection has been met by us by the use of the phrase 'as it were'; they bind him as it were, i.e. only apparently.

4. *Rūpa* (form) etc. are qualities (*Guṇas*) inhering in substances (*dravya*). But, *Sattva*, *Rajas*, and *Tamas*, constitute Prakṛti and are the bases of all substances, and they connot therefore be said to be attributes or qualities inhering in substances (as opposed to the substances). (Ā). The three Guṇas of Prakṛti (though so-termed) are not to be confused with the guṇas which are mentioned as one of the categories (*padārthas*) in the Vaiśeṣika system of philosophy.

5. They show up the Self as being affected by their own modifications. (Ā)

6. The possessor of the body who thinks that the body is himself. (Ā)

7. The soul is in fact immutable, but such is the potency of Māyā that he appears to be bound. (Ā)

तत्र सत्त्वं निर्मलत्वात्प्रकाशकमनामयम् ।
सुखसङ्गेन बध्नाति ज्ञानसङ्गेन चानघ ॥ ६ ॥

Tatra sattvam nirmalatvāt-prakāśakam-anāmayam
Sukha-saṅgena badhnāti jñāna-saṅgena cānagha

6. Of these, *Sattva*, which being stainless is luminous and free from evil, binds, by the attachment to happiness and by the attachment to knowledge, O sinless one.

Of these, Sattva and the rest, the characteristics of *Sattva* are thus stated: *being stainless* like a crystal of quartz (sphaṭika). It *is luminous, and free from evil*[8], free from trouble. And list *binds* fast: how?—*by the attachment to happiness*[9], by bringing about the union of the subject, the Self, with the object, namely happiness, by making him feel "I am happy". But this union with happiness is only an illusion; it is avidyā. For no attribute of an object can indeed pertain to the subject; and the Lord has declared that all the attributes, from 'desire' to 'fortitude' (XIII.6) pertain only to the kṣetra, the object. Wherefore, it is only through avidyā, which is superimposed as an attribute (dharma) of the Self, in the form of the want of discrimination of the object from the subject, that Sattva causes the Self to be in union as it were with happiness, which does not form ihis essential nature; it makes him appear as if he were addicted (to happiness); it causes him, who is devoid of (contact with) happiness, appear like one feeling happy. *And* in like manner, (Sattva binds the Self) *by attachment to knowledge.* Being spoken of along with happiness, 'knowledge' (here) refers to an attribute of the kṣetra (Matter) alone, namely of the antah-karaṇa, and not of the Self[10]. If it were an

8. It is stainless, transparent, and capable of resisting its being veiled; hence it is luminous, capable of revealing consciousness (*caitanya*); and free from evil, because it exceedingly reveals happiness, being spotless in its nature. (Ā)

9. The happiness referred to is that modification of *Sattva* which reflects the true (*mukhya*) happiness of the Self. (Ā)

10. 'Knowledge' is that modification of the *Sattva* which enables objects to be cognised; and through it *Sattva* binds the Self with the false conceit that he is an intelligent being (*jñānin*). (Ā)

attribute of the Self, there can be no attachment with it, and it cannot also bind (the Self). 'Attachment to knowledge' and the like[11] should be understood in the same way as 'attachment to happiness.'

O sinless one, you who are devoid of vice.

रजो रागात्मकं विद्धि तृष्णाऽऽसङ्गसमुद्भवम् ।
तन्निबध्नाति कौन्तेय कर्मसङ्गेन देहिनम् ॥ ७ ॥

Rajo rāgātmakam viddhi tṛṣṇā(ā)saṅga-samudbhavam
Tan-nibadhnāti Kaunteya karma-saṅgena dehinam

7. Know *Rajas* to be of the nature of passion, the source of thirst and attachment; it binds fast, O son of Kuntī, the embodied, by attachment to action.

Know, understand, *Rajas to be of the nature of passion*, colouring (the soul) like a piece of red chalk etc.; (know) it to be *the source of thirst and attachment*, as that which gives rise to thirst, namely, the longing for what has not been attained, and to attachment, namely the mental bond, known as affection, towards an object which has been attained. *It*, that Rajas, *binds fast, O son of Kuntī, the embodied, by attachment to action*, by causing him to be devoted to actions[12] productive of seen and unseen results.

तमस्त्वज्ञानजं विद्धि मोहनं सर्वदेहिनाम् ।
प्रमादालस्यनिद्राभिस्तन्निबध्नाति भारत ॥ ८ ॥

Tamastvajñānajam viddhi mohanam sarva-dehinām
Pramādālasya nidrābhis-tan nibadhnāti Bhārata

11. Referring to lordship (*aiśvarya*) etc. Attachment to these should also be understood as caused by *avidyā*. (Ā)

12. It induces the Self, who is non-agent, to act with the conceit, 'I am doing'. (Ā)

8. And know *Tamas* born of ignorance, delusive to all embodied beings; it binds fast, O Bhārata, by negligence, indolence and sleep.

And know Tamas, the third Guṇa, *born of ignorance, delusive to*, causing delusion, non-discrimination in, *all embodied beings*, all those that bear a body. *It*, Tamas, *binds fast, O Bhārata, by negligence*[13], by *indolence*[14] *and* by *sleep*.

The action of the *Guṇas* is again stated briefly.

सत्त्वं सुखे सञ्जयति रजः कर्मणि भारत ।
ज्ञानमावृत्य तु तमः प्रमादे सञ्जयत्युत ॥ ९ ॥

Sattvam sukhe sañjayati rajaḥ karmaṇi Bhārata
Jñanam-āvṛtya tu tamaḥ pramāde sañjayatyuta

9. *Sattva* attaches to happiness, and *Rajas* to action, O Bhārata, while *Tamas*, verily shrouding knowledge, attaches to negligence.

Sattva attaches (the embodied being) *to happiness, and Rajas* attaches (him) *to action, O Bhārata, while Tamas, verily*, by its nature as a veil, *shrouding knowledge*, the intelligence produced by Sattva, *attaches* one *to negligence*, namely, to the non-performance of the necesary duties.

When do the *Gunas* produce the effects mentioned above?[15] The answer is:

रजस्तमश्चाभिभूय सत्त्वं भवति भारत ।
रजः सत्त्वं तमश्चैव तमःसत्त्वं रजस्तथा ॥ १० ॥

13. Negligence is the non-performance of the duty, which was intended to be done, owing to preoccupation with another activity. (Ā)

14. Indolence is the obstacle to exertion caused by indifference or lack of desire. (Ā)

15. The question raises the doubts: Do *Sattva*, and the other *Guṇas* rise simultaneously, and, if so, without mutual conflict, or in (mutual) discord? Or, do they rise (at different times) in their turn? The answer is that they arise each in its turn. (Ā)

Rajas-tamascābhibhūya sattvam bhavati Bhārata
Rajaḥ sattvam tamaścaiva tamaḥ sattvam rajas-tathā

10. *Sattva* arises, O Bhārata, predominating over *Rajas* and *Tamas*; and *Rajas*, over *Sattva* and *Tamas*; so also *Tamas*, over *Sattva* and *Rajas*.

Sattva arises predominating over Rajas and Tamas: when Sattva increases, subjugating both Rajas and Tamas, then, asserting its nature, it begins to produce its own effect, namely, knowledge, happiness, etc. *O Bhārata. And*, similarly, when the *Rajas* Guṇa increases, (predominating) *over*, subjugating, both *Sattva and Tamas*, then, it begins to produce its effects namely, attachment to activity etc. *So also*, when the Guṇa called *Tamas* increases, predominating *over* both *Sattva and Rajas*, then it begins to produce its effect namely, the veiling of knowledge, etc.

What is the indicatory mark by which it can be known when a particular *Guṇa* is predominant? The reply follows:

सर्वद्वारेषु देहेऽस्मिन्प्रकाश उपजायते ।
ज्ञानं यदा तदा विद्याद्विवृद्धं सत्त्वमित्युत ॥ ११ ॥

Sarva-dvāreṣu dehe(a)smin-prakāśa upajāyate
Jñānām yadā tadā vidyād-vivṛddham sattvam-ityuta

11. When at every gate in this body there arises the light of intelligence, then, it should be known that *Sattva* is predominant.

When at every gate in this body, all the senses, such as the organ of hearing, which are the gateways of perception for the Self, *there arises the light of intelligence*: the functioning of the inner sense (antaḥkaraṇa) that is the buddhi, is light (illumination); and that itself is intelligence. When the light, known as intelligence, thus arises, *then* by that indicatory mark of intelligence-light, *it should* indeed *be known that Sattva is predominant*, has risen up (become perceptible).

The indicatory mark of *Rajas* being predominant are are follow:

लोभः प्रवृत्तिरारम्भः कर्मणामशमः स्पृहा ।
रजस्येतानि जायन्ते विवृद्धे भरतर्षभ ॥ १२ ॥

Lobhah-pravṛttir-ārambhaḥ karmaṇām-aśamaḥ spṛhā
Rajasyetāni jāyante vivṛddhe Bharatarṣabha

12. Greed, activity, the undertaking of actions, unrest, longing,—these arise when *Rajas* is predominant, O bull among Bhāratas!

Greed, desire to obtain the wealth of another, *activity*, action in general, *the undertaking of actions*, *unrest*, absence of restraint (of the senses), the manifestation of joy, attachment, etc., *longing*, thirst for all things in general,—*these* distinguishing marks *arise when* the Guṇa of *Rajas is predominant*, *O bull among Bhāratas*!

अप्रकाशोऽप्रवृत्तिश्च प्रमादो मोह एव च ।
तमस्येतानि जायन्ते विवृद्धे कुरुनन्दन ॥ १३ ॥

Aprakāśo(a)pravṛttiśca pramādo moha eva ca
Tamasyetāni jāyante vivṛddhe Kuru-nandana

13. Darkness, inertness, negligence, and also delusion,—these arise when *Tamas* is predominant, O descendant of Kuru!

Darkness, absence of discrimination (knowledge), *inertness*, total inactivity, the result of darkness, *negligence*[16], *and also delusion*, absence of (correct) judgment, error,—*these* marks *arise when* the Guṇa of *Tamas is predominant*, *O descendant of Kuru*!

16. explained already. (Ā)—(vide note 13 and Com. on Verse 9).

What fruit is obtained through (i.e. after) death, even all that fruit is due to attachment and desire, and is produced by the alone; for teaching this, the Lord says:

यदा सत्त्वे प्रवृद्धे तु प्रलयं याति देहभृत् ।
तदोत्तमविदां लोकानमलान्प्रतिपद्यते ॥ १४ ॥

Yadā sattve pravṛddhe tu pralayam yāti deha-bhṛt
Tadottama-vidām lokān-amalān-pratipadyate

14. If the embodied meets death when *Sattva* is predominant, then he attains to the spotless regions of the knowers of the highest.

If the embodied Self *meets death* (pralaya) *when Sattva is predominant*, has risen up, *then he attains to*, reaches, *the spotless*, untainted, *regions of the knowers of the highest*, of those who know the Mahat (The Intellect that is the first evolute of Prakṛti) and the like tattvas (principles)[17].

रजसि प्रलयं गत्वा कर्मसङ्गिषु जायते ।
तथा प्रलीनस्तमसि मूढयोनिषु जायते ॥ १५ ॥

Rajasi pralayam gatvā karmasangiṣu jāyate
Tathā pralīnas-tamasi mūḍha-yoniṣu jāyate

15. Meeting death in *Rajas*, he (the embodied) is born among those attached to action; so, dying in *Tamas*, he is born in the wombs of the irrational.

Meeting death in Rajas, i.e. when the Guṇa of Rajas is predominant, *he is born among those*, i.e. men, who are *attached to action*; *so*, and in like manner, *dying in Tamas*, when Tamas is predominant, *he is born in the wombs of the irrational*, cattle and the like.

17. such as Brahmaloka, which are not contaminated by Rajas or Tamas, as settled by scriptures (*āgamas*). (Ā); anyhow this is not *Moksa* (Liberation).

Now follows an epitome of the contents of the preceding verses:

कर्मणः सुकृतस्याहुः सात्त्विकं निर्मलं फलम् ।
रजसस्तु फलं दुःखमज्ञानं तमसः फलम् ॥ १६ ॥

Karmaṇaḥ sukṛtasyāhuḥ sāttvikam nirmalam phalam
Rajasastu phalam duḥkam-ajñānam tamasaḥ phalam

16. The fruit of good action, they say, is *Sāttvika* and pure; verily the fruit of *Rajas* is pain; and ignorance the fruit of *Tamas*.

The fruit of good action, i.e. Sāttvika action, *they*, the wise *say*, *is Sāttvika* alone *and pure*[18]; *verily the fruit of Rajas is pain*: as the topic dealt with is action, 'Rajas' means Rājasic action; its fruit is indeed pain alone, which is also Rājasic, corresponding to the cause[19]. *And*, similarly, *ignorance is the fruit of Tamas*, i.e. of Tāmasic action, adharma (sin).

And what arises out of the *Guṇas*?

सत्त्वात्सञ्जायते ज्ञानं रजसो लोभ एव च ।
प्रमादमोहौ तमसो भवतोऽज्ञानमेव च ॥ १७ ॥

Sattvāt-sañjāyate jñānam rajaso lobha eva ca
Pramāda-mohau tamaso bhavato(a)jñānam-eva ca

17. From *Sattva* arises intelligence; and greed from *Rajas*; negligence and delusion, as also ignorance arise from *Tamas*.

18. The result is that accomplished by *Sattva* alone, and is uncontaminated by the impurities produced by *Rajas* and *Tamas*. (Ā)

19. The cause (*Rajas*) is a mixture of a little good and plenty of bad; and, correspondingly, the result is predominantly painful, so that it can be said to be pain only. (Ā)

From Sattva, when it asserts itself, *arises intelligence*[20] *and greed from Rajas*; *negligence and delusion*, these two, *as also ignorance, arise from Tamas*.

Moreover,

ऊर्ध्वं गच्छन्ति सत्त्वस्था मध्ये तिष्ठन्ति राजसाः ।
जघन्यगुणवृत्तिस्था अधो गच्छन्ति तामसाः ॥ १८ ॥

Urdhvam gacchanti sattvasthā madhye tisṭhanti rājasāḥ
Jaghanya-guṇa-vṛttisthā adho gacchanti tāmasāh

18. The *Sattva*-abiding go upwards; the *Rājasikas* remain in the middle; and the *Tāmasikas*, abiding in the function of the lowest *Guṇa*, go downwards.

The Sattva-abiding, those who abide in the functions (i.e.) follow the course) of Sattva-Guṇa, *go upwards*, they will be born in the world of the devas and the like. *The Rājasikas remain in the middle*: they will be born among men. *And the Tāmasikas, abiding in the function of the lowest Guṇa* Tamas:—that is to say, the foolish who abide in sleep, indolence, etc.—*go downwards*: they will be born (in the wombs) of cattle and the like.

In the preceding chapter (XIII.21), it has been briefly taught that the cause of the *Puruṣa's saṁsāra* namely, his taking birth in good and evil wombs, is his attachment to the *guṇas*, which he, as seated in *Prakṛti*, that is to say, as united with false knowledge (*mithyā-jñāna*), has for objects of enjoyment, namely, for the *Guṇas* which appear in the character of pleasure, pain and delusion, and which is manifested in the forms, "I am happy", "I am miserable", "I am deluded", etc. The same has been stated at length here, in the verses beginning from, "*Sattva, Rajas, Tamas*—these *guṇas* born of Prakṛti" (XIV.5), dealing with the nature of the *guṇas*, their functions, how they bind by their functions, what is the destiny of the persons who are bound by the functions of the

20. manifested through the senses. (Ā). (vide verse 11).

guṇas; all of which relate to the cause of bondage, namely false knowledge, rooted in ignorance. Now, it remains to be taught that Liberation accrues from Plenary (Right) Knowledge; so, the Lord says:

नान्यं गुणेभ्यः कर्तारं यदा द्रष्टाऽनुपश्यति ।
गुणेभ्यश्च परं वेत्ति मद्भावं सोऽधिगच्छति ॥ १९ ॥

Nānyam guṇebhyaḥ kartāram yadā draṣṭā (a)nupaśyati
Guṇebhyaśca param vetti mad-bhāvam so (a)dhigacchati

19. When the seer beholds no agent other than the *guṇas* and knows That which is higher than the *guṇas*, he attains to My being.

When the seer, the man of enlightenment, *beholds no agent other than the guṇas*, when he discovers that there is no agent other than the guṇas which transform themselves into the bodies, senses and sense-objects; and that the guṇas alone in all their modifications are the agents of all actions; *and knows That which is higher than the guṇas*, sees Him who is distinct from the guṇas and is (merely) the witness of the guṇas and of their functions, then, *he*, that seer, *attains to My being*[21].

How he attains to it is now being stated.

गुणानेतानतीत्य त्रीन्देही देहसमुद्भवान् ।
जन्ममृत्युजरादुःखैर्विमुक्तोऽमृतमश्नुते ॥ २० ॥

Guṇān-etān-atītya trīn-dehī deha-samudhhavān
Janma-mṛtyu-jarā-duḥkhair-vimukto(a)mṛtam-aśnute

21. He realises Brahman as his Self, his identity with Brahman becomes manifest. (Ā)

20. Having gone beyond these *guṇas* which originate the body, the embodied is freed from birth, death, decay and pain, and attains to immortality.

Having gone, while still alive, *beyond these three guṇas*, which have been described above, and which constitute the upādhi of Māyā[22], and *which originate the body*, which form the seed which produces the body, *the embodied*, the enlightened person, *is freed from birth, death, decay and pain*, while still alive, *and attains to immortality*: in this manner He attains to My being.

From the declaration that the enlightened seer goes beyond the guṇas and attains to immortality even while still alive, Arjuna got an occasion for (further) questioning:

अर्जुन उवाच —
कैर्लिङ्गैस्त्रीन्गुणानेतानतीतो भवति प्रभो ।
किमाचारः कथं चैतांस्त्रीन्गुणानतिवर्तते ॥ २१ ॥

Arjuna uvāca—

Kair-liṅgais-trīn-guṇān-etān-atīto bhavati prabho
Kim-acāraḥ katham caitāṁs-trīn-guṇān-ativartate

Arjuna said:

21. With what marks, O Lord, is he who has gone beyond these three *guṇas*? What is his conduct, and how does he pass beyond these three *guṇas*?

With what marks, characteristics, *is he who has gone beyond these*, the above-described, *three guṇas*[23], *O Lord*? *What is his*

22. *Sattva* and other *guṇas*, which appear as all evils (*anartha*), constitute *Māyā*, which is the *upādhi*. (Ā)

23. What is asked for is about the means to be resorted to for attaining the end which eventually and automatically become the natural characteristics of the perfected seer. (Ā). See Com. at the end of II. 54.

codduct[24], *and how*, by what means, *does he pass beyond these three guṇas*?

Having been questioned by Arjuna about the characteristics of the person who has gone beyond the *guṇas* and the means to passing beyond the *guṇas*, the Lord proceeds in this verse to answer the two questions. 'First, as to the question, "With what marks is he who has gone beyond the *guṇas*?",—listen:

श्री भगवानुवाच —
प्रकाशं च प्रवृत्तिं च मोहमेव च पाण्डव ।
न द्वेष्टि संप्रवृत्तानि न निवृत्तानि काङ्क्षति ॥ २२ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Prakāśam ca pravṛttim ca moham-eva ca Pāṇḍava
Na dveṣṭi sampravṛttāni na nivṛttāni kaṅkṣati

The Blessed Lord said—

22. He hates not light and activity, as also delusion, O Pāṇḍava, when (they have) well set in, nor longs for them when absent.

He hates not light (i.e. the light of knowledge and happiness, which is), the effect of Sattva, *and activity*, the effect of Rajas, *as also delusion*, the effect of Tamas, *when* they have *well set in*, when they rise, up, clearly presenting themselves as objects of consciousness.

By reason of being devoid of Right Knowledge, one hates (dislikes the effects of the guṇas) in this manner: "a Tāmasic notion has arisen in me, and I have been deluded by it"; similarly, "a Rājasic activity has arisen in me, which is painful, and impelled by that Rajas I have been disturbed from my normal nature, and this fall from my natural condition has brought evil to me"; so

24. This is to find out whether he would behave as he pleased (without restraint). (Ā)

again, "the Sāttvic, Guṇa, luminous in nature, makes me intelligent (discerning) and attaches me to happiness, and thereby binds me". But the person who has gone beyond the Guṇas does not hate (dislike) them in the manner stated, when they set in.

Besides, unlike the man of Sāttvic, or Rājasic, or Tāmasic nature, who longs (again) for the effects of Sattva, Rajas, or Tamas which (once) presented themselves before him but have disappeared, the person who has gone beyond the guṇas *does not long for them when absent.*[25]

This is a mark which is not visible to others; one the other hand, being cognisable by one's own self, it is an indication to himself alone. Indeed, the dislike or longing resting in a persons' consciousness cannot be perceived by another.

Now the Lord gives the answer to the question: "What is the conduct of him who has gone beyond the *guṇas*?"—

उदासीनवदासीनो गुणैर्यो न विचाल्यते ।
गुणावर्तन्त इत्येव योऽवतिष्ठति नेङ्गते ।२३।।

Udāsīnavad-āsīno guṇair-yo na vicālyate
Guṇāvartanta ityeva yo(a)vatiṣṭhati neṅgate

23. He who, sitting like one unconcerned, is moved not by the *guṇas*, who, knowing that the *guṇas* operate, merely stays firm and moves not,

(The sentence is completed in verse 25)

He, the knower of the Self, the saṁnyāsin, *who, sitting like one unconcerned*, like a neutral person who does not take any side, and adhering to the path[26] which is the means for going beyond the guṇas, *is moved not by the guṇas*, does not get shaken

25. Well perceiving that the effects of the Guṇas do not pertain to the Self, he neither gets afflicted by them nor longs for them, by imagining them to be unfavourable or favourable to himself. (Ā)

26. namely, Self-knowledge. (Ā)

from his position, that of discernment[27]. The Lord makes this clear (by what follows): *who, knowing that the guṇas*, transforming themselves in the forms of the effect (body), the instruments (senses), and the sense-objects, *operate*, each on the others, *merely stays firm*,—The grammatical form in "Parasmaipada"[28] has been used to preserve the metrical form.

A variant reading (for "avatisthati") is "anu-tiṣṭhati", "(merely) engages in action"[29].

And moves not, remains unshaken: he stays merely in his own true nature.

Also,

समदुःखसुखः स्वस्थः समलोष्टाश्मकाञ्चनः ।
तुल्यप्रियाप्रियो धीरस्तुल्यनिन्दात्मसंस्तुतिः ॥ २४ ॥

Sama-duḥkha-sukhaḥ svasthaḥ sama-loṣṭāśma-kāñcanaḥ
Tulya-priyāpriyo dhīras-tulya-nindātma-saṁstutiḥ

24. He to whom pain and pleasure are the same, who abides in himself, to whom a clod of earth, a stone, and gold, are alike; to whom the agreeable and the disagreeable are the same, who is firm, to whom censure and praise of himself are the same;

He to whom pain and pleasure are the same, who abides in himself, the Self,—that is to say, is calm[30], *to whom a clod of earth*,

27. The Knower of the Self, who remains with the awareness of the immutability of the Self, is rid of the idea of his being an agent (of action) and ceases to engage himself in activity. (Ā)

28. One of the two voices in which verbs in Sanskrit are conjugated. It is the "voice for another", whereas, the other voice *Ātmanepada* is the "voice for oneself", *Avatiṣṭhati* (in *Parasuraipada*) has been used instead of *Avatiṣṭhate* to fit in with prosodic rule.

29. His 'engaging in action' is merely the continuation of activity (in the eyes of others), which (for him) is not his. (Ā)

30. that is, remains immutable. (Ā)

a stone, and gold are alike; *to whom the agreeable and the disagreeable are the same, who is firm*, a man of wisdom, *to whom censure and praise of himself are the same*, that is to say, he who has controlled himself ("yati");

Also,

मानापमानयोस्तुल्यस्तुल्यो मित्रारिपक्षयोः ।
सर्वारम्भपरित्यागी गुणातीतः स उच्यते ॥ २५ ॥

Mānāpamānayos-tulyas-tulyo mitrāri-pakṣayoḥ
Sarvārambha-parityāgi gunātītaḥ sa ucyate

25. the same in honour and disgrace, the same to friend and foe, relinquishing all undertakings,—he is said to have gone beyond the *guṇas*.

The same in honour and disgrace, i.e. unaffected by them, *the same to friend add foe*,—even though some people, in their own opinion, are neutral, in the opinion of others they appear as taking the side of a friend or that of a foe; but this person (in the eyes of others also) is the same towards friend and foe; *relinquishing all undertakings*, actions which are intended to secure seen and unseen results; i.e. he renounces all actions except those needed for maintaining the body—*he is said to have gone beyond the guṇas*.

As long as all that has been spoken of—beginning from "He who, sitting like one unconcerned" (XIV.23), and ending "he is said to have gone beyond the *guṇas*" (XIV.25)—are virtues (attributes, dharmas) to be secured by effort, so long are they to be practised by the *saṁnyāsin* who seeks liberation, since they are the means to going beyond the *guṇas*; but when they become permanent, they constitute the marks of the ascetic who has gone beyond the *guṇas*, discernible by himself.[31]

31. The attributes referred to have to be secured by special effort prior to the dawn of Self-Knowledge; and the qualified aspirant has to practise them as being the means to that Knowledge. And, when Self-Knowledge has arisen all the attributes become permanent in him, the *jīvanmukta*, and serve as marks, (of liberation) experienced by himself. (Ā)

Now, the Lord proceeds to answer the question, "How does he pass beyond the three guṇas?"—

मां च योऽव्यभिचारेण भक्तियोगेन सेवते ।
स गुणान्समतीत्यैतान्ब्रह्मभूयाय कल्पते ॥ २६ ॥

Mām ca yo(a)vyabhicāreṇa bhakti-yogena sevate
Sa guṇān-samatītyaitān-Brahma-bhūyāya kalpate

26. And he who serves Me with unswerving devotion, (thereby) going beyond these *guṇas*, is fitted for becoming Brahman.

And he, the ascetic, or the man of works (karmin), *who serves Me*, the Īśvara, Nārāyaṇa, residing in the heart of all beings, *with unswerving devotion*: devotion (Bhakti) is itself Yoga; with that Bhakti-yoga[32], which never becomes fickle; *going beyond these*, the above-mentioned, *guṇas, is fitted for becoming Brahman*, i.e. becomes qualified for mokṣa (liberation).

How can it be so?[33]—this is answered:

ब्रह्मणो हि प्रतिष्ठाऽहममृतस्याव्ययस्य च ।
शाश्वतस्य च धर्मस्य सुखस्यैकान्तिकस्य च ॥ २७ ॥

Brahmaṇo hi pratiṣṭhā(a)ham-amṛtasyāvyayasya ca
Śāśvatasya ca dharmasya sukhasyaikāntikasya ca

27. For I am the Abode of Brahman, the Immortal, and the Immutable, and the Ever-lasting, the Dharma, and the Absolute Bliss.

32. Bhakti is supreme love (*parama-prema*); and it is *Yoga*, since it leads to union with the Supreme. Always contemplating the Lord, without allowing the mind to be distracted otherwise, is serving Him by Bhakti-yoga. Through the Lord's grace, such a person is blessed with (Right) Plenary Knowledge, and becomes Brahman, while still alive. (Ā)

33. i.e. how can the enlightened person be himself Brahman? (Ā)

For, because, *I*, the Pratyagātman (the true Inner Self) *am the Abode of*, that wherein is established, *Brahman*, the Supreme Self (Paramātman).

Of what nature is that Brahman?—*the Immortal*, Imperishable, *and the Immutable*, the unchanging, *and the Ever-lasting*, eternal, *the Dharma*, that is, who is attainable by the Dharma of Jñāna Yoga (the Path of Knowledge); *and the Absolute Bliss*, the unfailing Happiness.

The *Pratyagātman* (the Inner Self) is the abode of the *Paramātman* (the Supreme Self), Who is Immortal, etc., by His essential nature; and, therefore, the *Pratyagātman* is concluded to be the very *Paramātman*, by Right (Plenary) Knowledge. It is this that has been stated in the verse, "He is fitted for becoming Brahman (XIV.26). The import is this: Brahman activates Himself through His Īśvara-śakti (the power He has, to manifest Himself,as Īśvara" the Lord of the universe) for the purpose of bestowing His grace on His devotees, etc. I am that Śakti, and therefore Brahman Himself; for Śakti (power) and Śaktimān (He in whom the power inheres) cannot be different.

Another interpretation of the verse is as follows: According to the (primary) expressed meaning of the word (Brahman), the Brahman referred to is the Conditioned Brahman. Of that (Conditioned) Brahman, the abode is Myself, the Un-conditioned, and none else. What is the nature of the Conditioned Brahman? He is Immortal, not subject to death; and Immutable, not subject to destruction or decay. I am also the abode of the eternal Dharma of the Path of devotion to Knowledge and the Absolute Bliss, the unfailing happiness that is born of that devotion.

इति श्रीमहाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्यां
भीष्मपर्वणि श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु
ब्रह्मविद्यायां योगशास्त्रे श्रीकृष्णार्जुन-
संवादे गुणत्रयविभागयोगो
नाम चतुर्दशोऽध्यायः ॥

Iti Śrī Mahābhārate śata-sāhasryām saṁhitāyām Vaiyāsikyām Bhīṣma-Parvaṇi Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītāsūpaniṣatsu Brahma-vidyāyām yoga śāstre Śrī Kṛṣṇārjuna samvāde Guṇa-traya-vibhāga-yogo nāma caturdaśo(a)dhyāyāḥ.

Thus the fourteenth chapter entitled 'The Way of Discriminating the Three Guṇas' in the Upaniṣads known as 'The Celebrated Songs of the Lord,' expounding the Knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna—embodied in the Bhīṣma-Parva of Śrī Mahābhārata, the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyāsa.

॥ पञ्चदशोऽध्यायः ॥
(पुरुषोत्तमयोगः)

PAÑCADAŚO(A)DHYĀYAḤ

(PURUṢOTTAMA YOGAḤ)

CHAPTER - XV

(WAY TO THE SUPREME SPIRIT)

Wherefore the fruit of actions performed by the men of action (*karmins*) and the fruit of Knowledge of the wise are dependent on Me, therefore those who serve Me with Bhakti-yoga attain to Liberation, by getting Knowledge through My grace and going beyond the *guṇas*. Need it then be said that those who thoroughly understand the true nature of the Self attain Liberation? Accordingly, the Lord wishes to teach the true nature of the Self, even without Arjuna's asking, and says (what follows) beginning with the word "With roots above".

First, with a view to producing *Vairāgya* (non-attachment), He describes the nature of *saṁsāra* (transmigratory existence) by representing it as a tree[1]; for it is only he, who is free from attachment to transmigratory existence, and none other, who is qualified for the knowledge concerning the real nature of the Lord.

श्री भगवानुवाच —

ऊर्ध्वमूलमधःशाखमश्वत्थं प्राहुरव्ययम् ।
छन्दांसि यस्य पर्णानि यस्तं वेद स वेदवित् ॥ १ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Ūrdhva-mūlam-adhaḥ-śākham-aśvattham prāhur-avyayam
Chandāṁsi yasya parṇāni yas-tam veda sa veda-vit

1. The cause of bondage (*saṁsāra*) is spoken of as a tree, to show that it can be destroyed (like a tree). (Ā)

The Blessed Lord said—

1. They speak of an external *Aśvattha* (tree), with roots above and branching below, whose leaves are the Vedas. He who knows it is a Veda-knower.

They speak of an eternal Aśvattha (tree) with roots above: Brahman with its un-manifested (avyakta) potentiality (śakti) of Māyā[2] is spoken of as the 'above', It being subtle in point of time, being the Cause, being eternal, and being supreme[3]. It, the One above, is the root of this tree of saṁsāra and the latter is accordingly said to have its roots above. The Śruti declares: "With its roots above and its branches below stands this eternal Aśvattha" (Ka.II.iii.1). In the Purāṇa also, it is stated:

"The eternal tree of Brahman[4] has sprung up from the root, "Avyakta" (the Unmanifested); and it has developed by the strength of the very same Avyakta. Its trunk is buddhi, and its hollows are the apertures of the senses; its branches are the Great Elements, its leaves are the sense-objects; its fair flowers are dharma and adharma; it yeilds the fruits of pleasure and pain; and it provides livelihood to all creatures. And it is the resort of Brahman, wherein Brahman acts eternally[5]. Cutting off and splitting this tree with the supreme sword of Knowledge[6] and then attaining to the bliss of the Self, one does not come back again therefrom" (M.B. Aśv. 47. 12-15) and so on.

2. Since Brahman, the Immutable (*kūṭastha*) cannot by Itself be the cause, Brahman with Māyā is to be understood. (Ā)

3. It is subtle in point of time, as being the cause, the invariable antecedent of all effects, and thus eternal. And as It is all-pervading, It is great supreme. (Ā)

4. i.e. the tree presided over, occupied, led, superintended by Brahman. It is eternal, since it cannot be destroyed except by Knowledge (Ā)

5. Brahman abides in the tree of *saṁsāra*; of that tree of *saṁsāra*, Brahman is the essence (*sāra-bhūtam*). Or, Brahman is the support of this tree of *saṁsāra*, the infinite universe that is *saṁsāra*; it (*saṁsāra*) has no basis otherwise than in Brahman; for, indeed, it is Brahman alone, that, owing to *avidyā*, becomes subject to *saṁsāra* (mundane existence). (Ā)

6. i.e. the unswerving knowledge that "I am Brahman". (Ā)

And that tree, the illusory saṁsāra, with roots above, they speak of as *branching below*.. Mahat (the Great: Intellect), Ahaṁkara (Egoism), the Tan-mātras (Elemental Essences), etc., which form its branches as it were, extend downwards; and therefore the tree is spoken of as branching below.

They call it *Aśvattya*, because it does not remain the same even for a day (lit. till tomorrow; "a": not, "śva"; tomorrow and is perishable every moment.

This tree of saṁsāra is said to be *eternal*: since the illusion of saṁsāra has been existing from eternity (anādi-kāla), and rests, as is well-known, on the succession of bodies etc., without beginning or end, therefore they say it is eternal. Of that same tree of saṁsāra, there is this further attribute: *Its leaves are the Vedas*. The Vedas Ṛk, Yajus and Sāman, are as it were the leaves of the tree of saṁsāra, since like leaves they protect[7] it. Just as leaves serve to protect a tree, the Vedas serve to protect the tree of saṁsāra by making known dharma, adharma, and their causes and effects[8].

He who knows it, the tree of saṁsāra and its Root, as described above, *is a Veda-knower*, one who has known the Teaching of the Vedas. Verily, there is nothing, not even an iota, which remains to be known, beyond this tree of saṁsāra and its Root; therefore,he who knows this Teaching of the Vedas is all-knowing— thus the Lord extols the knowledge of the tree and its Root[9].

Of that very tree of saṁsāra, another figurative representation of (its) members is stated:

अधश्चोर्ध्वं प्रसृतास्तस्य शाखा गुणप्रवृद्धा विषयप्रवालाः ।
अधश्च मूलान्यनुसन्ततानि कर्मानुबन्धीनि मनुष्यलोके ॥ २ ॥

7. From the root '*chad*', to cover , to protect. (Ā). "Chandas" is the word used for the Veda in the text here.

8. The *karma-kāṇḍas* of the Vedas describe the fruits of actions, namely, the ascent and the descent of the soul, and are full of *artha-vādas* (explanations) Thereby they protect the tree of saṁsāra and cover up the defects inherent in it. (Ā)

9. On knowing the tree of *saṁsāra* and its Root, it is possible to discard the non-Root and extract the Root alone and realise It; and one should strive for this. This is the object in praising the knowledge of the tree and the Root. (Ā)

Adhaścordhvam prasṛtās-tasya śākhā guṇa-
pravṛddhā viṣaya-pravālāḥ
Adhaśca mūlānyanusantatāni karmānubandhīni
manuṣya-loke

2. Below and above spread its branches, nourished by the *guṇās*; sense-objects are its buds; and below, in the world of men, stretch forth the roots, ending in action.

Below, from men down to stationary objects, *and above*, from (the world of) men up to the position (region) of Brahmā, the Creator of the universe, whatever abodes (bodies) are attained, in accordance with deeds and kowledge, as the fruit of knowledge and action—they are, as it were, the *branches* of that tree *spreading* out; they are *nourished by the guṅas*, attened by the guṅas, Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas, which constitute their material cause (upādāna); *the sense-objects*, sound and the rest, *are*, as it were, *its buds*, they appear as though they have sprouted from the branches, namely, the bodies etc. which are the fruits of actions.

Of the tree of saṁsāra, the Highest Root, the material Cause, has already been stated. And now will be mentioned what the secondary roots, as it were, (of that tree) are; namely, the latent impressions (vāsanās) such as attachment and aversion, which, engendered by the results of actions, constitute the motive cause for acts of dharma and adharma. *And these roots stretch forth*, completely pervade[10], *below*, i.e. with reference to the (above of) devas and such like, *in the world of men, ending in action*: they (the vāsanās) are said to 'end in action,, as being, in perpetual succession, the cause and the consequence of good and evil deeds. These roots especially stretch into the world of men; it is indeed well-known that, in this world, men get the competence to engage themselves in action[11].

10. The feelings of attachment, aversion, etc., are ever present in the *liṅga-śarīras* (subtle bodies) of all. (Ā)

11. Only when one has a human body, such as that of a Brāhmaṇ etc., does he become fitted for the uninterrupted performance of *karma*. (Ā)

As regards this tree of saṁsāra which has been described:

न रूपमस्येह तथोपलभ्यते नान्तो न चादिर्न च संप्रतिष्ठा ।
अश्वत्थमेनं सुविरूढमूलमसङ्गशस्त्रेण दृढेन छित्त्वा ॥ ३ ॥

Na rūpamasyeha tathopalabhyate nānto na cādir-na ca sampratiṣṭhā
Aśvattham-enam suvīrūdha-mūlam-asaṅga-śastreṇa dṛḍhena chittvā

3. Its form is not here perceived as such, neither its end, nor its origin, nor its existence. Having cut as under this firm-rooted *Aśvattha* with the strong axe of non-attachment;

(The sentence is completed in the next verse.)

[12]*Its form is not here perceived as such*, i.e. as described above; for, it is similar to a dream, the water of a mirage, the illusion of magic, and an imaginary city in the sky (gandharva-nagara), having indeed the nature of appearing and vanishing (every moment); and just for this reason, *neither its end*, limit, termination, completion, is seen; *nor its origin either*; none is capable of knowing from where this (saṁsāra) has proceeded; *nor its existence*, nor too is the condition in between (the origin and the end) perceived by anybody. *Having cut as under*, uprooted, *this firm-rooted Aśvattha*, the tree of saṁsāra, described above, together with its seed *with the strong axe of non-attachment*, the abandonment of the desire for progeny, wealth, and worlds, made strong by the mental resolve directed towards the Supreme Self and sharpened again and again on the whetstone of the practice of discrimination[13];

12. It may be doubted that the tree of *saṁsāra* which is beginningless, and which is maintained by attachment etc., is not liable to destruction in itself; and is also incapable of being cut off by anybody. As to this, the Lord says that .though not perceived through the senses) the nature of the tree, as described above, is inferable from Scripture (Śāstra); and, so, its destruction by Knowledge is possible. (Ā)

13. Since error (illusion), *vāsanas*, (latent potencies) and actions, mutually produce one another, *saṁsāra* has no end in the absence of Knowledge. And, because it is firm-rooted, intense exertion is needed for uprooting it, through renunciation accompanied with non-attachment (*vairāgya*). (Ā)

ततः पदं तत्परिमार्गितव्यं यस्मिन्गता न निवर्तन्ति भूयः ।
तमेव चाद्यं पुरुषं प्रपद्ये यतः प्रवृत्तिः प्रसृता पुराणी ॥ ४ ॥

Tatah padam tat-parimārgitavyam yasmin-gatā da nivartanti bhūyaḥ
Tam-eva cādyam puruṣam prapadye yataḥ pravṛttiḥ prasṛtā purāṇī

4. then, (after cutting as under the *Aśvattha* of *saṁsāra*), that Goal is to be sought for, going whither they do not return again. I seek refuge in that Primeval *Puruṣa* from whom streamed forth the Eternal Activity.

Then, that Goal beyond[14], the abode of Viṣṇu (the All-pevading), *is to be sought for*, (and) known; *going whither*, having reached which Goal, *they do not return again* to saṁsāra.

How it should be sought for is thus stated: "*I seek refuge in that Primeval Puruṣa*". He who is spoken of as the Goal: He is to be sought after, by taking refuge in Him. Who is this Puruṣa?—He, *from whom streamed forth the Eternal Activity*, the projection of the tree of the illusory saṁsāra (the ever-flowing current of evolution, the world of phenomena), just as illusory images (māyā) are projected from out of a juggler (a performer of indra-jāla)[15].

What sort of persons reach that Goal?—that is stated:

निर्मानमोहा जितसङ्गदोषा अध्यात्मनित्या विनिवृत्तकामाः ।
द्वन्द्वैर्विमुक्ताः सुखदुःखसंज्ञैर्गच्छन्त्यमूढाः पदमव्ययं तत् ॥ ५ ॥

Nirmāna-mohā jita-saṅga-doṣā adhyātma-nityā vinivṛtta-kāmāḥ
Dvandvair-vimuktāḥ sukha-duḥkha-saṁjñair-gacchantyamūḍhaḥ padam-avyayam tat

14. i.e. beyond the *Aśvattha* tree. (Ā)

15. Cp. Com. on *Kaṭha-Upaniṣad* II. iii. 1, where the Commentator describes this tree of *saṁsāra* and its Root in detail.

5. Free from pride and delusion, with the evil of attachment conquered, ever dwelling in the Self, with desires completely receded, liberated from the pairs of opposites known as pleasure and pain, the undeluded reach that Goal Eternal.

Free from pride and delusion, with the evil of attachment conquered, they from whom pride[16] and delusion[17] have passed away, and by whom attachment which is an evil has been subdued[18], *ever dwelling in the Self*, who are exclusively devoted to the perception of the nature of the Supreme Self[19]; *with desires completely receded*, from whom desires have departed without leaving any defilement behind,—they are the ascetics, the saṁnyāsins,—*liberated from the pairs of opposites*, the agreeable and the disagreeable, etc.[20], *known as pleasure and pain*,—They, *the undeluded*[21] *reach that Goal Eternal*, described above.

That same Goal is again distinguished (as below):

न तद्भासयते सूर्यो न शशाङ्को न पावकः ।
यद्गत्वा न निवर्तन्ते तद्धाम परमं मम ॥ ६ ॥

Na tad-bhāsayate sūryo na śaśāṅko na pāvakaḥ
Yad-gatvā na nivartante tad-dhāma paramam mama

6. That the Sun illumines not, nor the Moon, nor Fire; That is My Supreme Abode, going whither they return not.

16. egotism (*ahaṁkāra*). (Ā)

17. non-discrimination (*aviveka*). (Ā)

18. i.e. they are devoid of the feeling of hatred towards foe, or of affection towards friend. (Ā)

19. i.e. devoted to *śravaṇa* and the rest. (Ā)

20. 'etc.' refers to their cause. (Ā)

21. they who have come by the Plenary (Right) Knowledge, by reason of the foregoing contributory causes. (Ā)

That—referring to the Abode mentioned later—the Goa which is the Abode of Light; *the Sun*, Āditya, though possessed of the power of illuminating all objects, *illumines not*) so also, *nor the Moon*, Candra, *nor Sire*, Agni even. That Abode, the Abode of Viṣṇu (the All-pervading), *going whither*, having attained to which, *they return not*, and which the Sun and others cannot illumine, *That is My*, Viṣṇu's, *Supreme Abode*.

It has been stated: "going whither they return not"; but it is wellknown that all going ends in returning and "(all) union ends in separation" (*Rom. Ayodhyā-kānda*. 105-16; *M.B. Strī-Parva* 2-3). How is it then said for those who reach that Abode, there is no return?

Listen to the reason therefor:

ममैवांशो जीवलोके जीवभूतः सनातनः ।
मनः षष्ठानीन्द्रियाणि प्रकृतिस्थानि कर्षति ॥ ७ ॥

Mamaivāṁśo jīva-loke jīva-bhūtaḥ sanātanaḥ
Manaḥ ṣaṣṭhānīndriyāṇi prakṛtisthāni karṣati

7. An eternal portion of Myself having become a living soul in the world of *jīvas*, draws (to itself) the (five) senses with mind for the sixth, abiding in *Prakṛti*.

An eternal portion, aspect, *of Myself*, the Supreme Self, *having become a living soul in the world of jīvas*, manifesting itself in every one as the doer and enjoyer, in saṁsāra:—Just as that aspect of the Sun seen as a reflection in water goes back to the Sun alone, never more to return, on the disappearance of the water which occasioned it, so also this aspect (of the Self) unites with the very Self, never to return. Or, it is like the space (ākāśa) in a jar (and the like), limited by the upādhi of jar (and the like), which seen as a portion of (this infinite) space, becomes one with the latter and does not return on the destruction of the cause (of limitation), namely the jar (and the like). Therefore, it has been rightly said "going whither they return not".

Objection:—Where is the possibility of (there being) any portion (or aspect) of the Supreme Self, Who is indivisible? Because, if He be with parts, He must suffer destruction (ruin) on the separation of parts.

Reply: This objection is not valid; for, what is imaginarily represented as a portion (aṁśa) is only an aspect (of the Self) limited by the upādhi set up by avidyā. This truth has been explained at length in the Chapter on the kṣetra (XIII)[22].

[23]How that jīva, imaginarily represented as a portion of Myself, takes birth in a body and how he passes out of it, will now be stated. (He, the jīva, does so,) *drawing*, i.e. attracting to himself, *the (five) senses*, hearing and the rest, *with mind for the sixth, abiding in Prakṛti*, in their natural places such as the orifice of the ear

When (does he draw them to himself)?

शरीरं यदवाप्नोति यच्चाप्युत्क्रामतीश्वरः ।
गृहीत्वैतानि संयाति वायुर्गन्धानिवाशयात् ॥ ८ ॥

Śarīram yad-avāpnoti yaccāpyutkrāmatīśvaraḥ
Gṛhītvaitāni saṁyāti vāyur-gandhānivaśayāt

8. When the lord obtains a body and when he leaves it, he takes these and goes, as the wind takes the scents from their seats.

When the lord, the master of the aggregate of the body etc., namely the jīva, *leaves the body*, then he draws these to himself, the (five) senses with the mind for the sixth. (Though appearing in the second quarter of the verse, this is to be taken first, as required by the sense of the passage.) *And, when he obtains*, i.e. enters, *a body* different from the previous body, *he takes these*

22. It has been established there that the *jīva* is in truth not a portion of, but that he is the same as, the Supreme Self. (Ā)

23. The doubt that, if the *jīva* is only imagined as a portion of the Supreme Self and is in fact identical with the Supreme Self there cannot be subjection to *saṁsāra* or passing out of it for him, is now answered. (Ā)

with him *and goes*. Like what, is stated: *as the wind takes the scents* with it *from their seats*, namely, flowers and the like.

Now, what are they (the senses)?

श्रोत्रं चक्षुः स्पर्शनं च रसनं घ्राणमेव च ।
अधिष्ठाय मनश्चायं विषयानुपसेवते ॥ ९ ॥

Śrotram cakṣuḥ sparśanam ca rasanam ghrāṇam eva ca
Adhiṣṭhāya manaścāyam viṣayān-upasevate

9. Presiding over the ear, the eye, and the touch, taste, and smell, as also the mind, he experiences objects.

Presiding separately *over* each sense-organ, *the ear*, *the eye*, *and the touch*, skin, *taste* (tongue), *and smell* .nose), *as also the mind*, which is the sixth, *he*, the dweller in the body, *experiences objects*, such as sound.

उत्क्रामन्तं स्थितं वापि भुञ्जानं वा गुणान्वितम् ।
विमूढा नानुपश्यन्ति पश्यन्ति ज्ञानचक्षुषः ॥ १० ॥

Utkrāmantam sthitam vāpi bhuñjānam vā guṇānvitam
Vimūḍhā nānupaśyanti pasyanti jñāna-cakṣuṣaḥ

10. He who departs, resides, and enjoys, who is united with the *guṇas*,—even him the deluded do not see; they (alone) see who have the eye of wisdom.

He, the dweller in the body, *who departs*, leaves the body previously acquired, *resides*, stays in the body, *and enjoys* sound and other objects which are directly perceived by him, *who is united with the guṇas*, who is always seen associated with effects such as pleasure, pain, and delusion, i.e. whom these accompany:;—*him*, who is of this nature, *even*, though he thus comes most easily within the range of their cognisance, *the deluded*, those who are

variously distracted, by reason of their minds being attracted by the strength of the desire for enjoyment of objects seen and unseen, *do not see*[24];

"And so, misery is their lot": thus, the Lord pities them.

On the other hand, *those who have the eye of wisdom*, produced by the true source of Knowledge[25], i.e. they who possess clear vision, *they* (alone) *see* him.

The (these) few, however,

यतन्तो योगिनश्चैनं पश्यन्त्यात्मन्यवस्थितम् ।
यतन्तोऽप्यकृतात्मानो नैनं पश्यन्त्यचेतसः ॥ ११ ॥

Yatanto yoginaścainam paśyantyātmanyavasthitam
Yatanto(a)pyakṛtātmāno nainam paśyantyacetasaḥ

11. The yogis, striving (for perfection) behold Him dwelling in themselves; but the un-refined and unintelligent, even though striving, see Him not.

The yogis, those with calm and concentrated minds, *striving*, making effort[26] (for perfection), *behold Him*, the Self under discussion, *dwelling in themselves*, in their own intellect (buddhi): they perceive Him directly, "This I am". *But the un-refined*, those whose mind has not been purified by religious austerity and conquest of the senses, who have not desisted from evil conduct, and whose pride has not been extinguished, *and unintelligent*, devoid of discrimination, *even though striving* with the aid of the proper means to knowledge such as the scriptures (śāstra), *see Him not*.[27]

24. Though the Ātman is the most proximate and therefore easily perceivable, yet all do not see Him, because of their complete subservience to sense-objects. (Ā)

25. The means to Knowledge, namely Scripture (*Śāstra*) aided by the science of logic (*nyāya*) is meant.

26. by taking to hearing (*śravaṇa*) and reflection (*manana*). (Ā)

27. For those whose mind is impure and who are therefore wanting in discrimination (between the permanent and the impermanent), the study of scriptures and the rest will not be fruitful. (Ā)

With a view to teaching that the Goal—which even the luminaries such as Fire (Agni) and the Sun, the illuminators of all objects, cannot make manifest; which having been found, seekers of liberation never more turn back to *saṁsāra*; of which the *jīvas* (individual souls) are but aspects (parts) manifested in conformity to the limiting adjuncts (*upādhis*), even as the space in a pot (*ghaṭākāśa*) etc. are of (the all-pervading) Space (*Ākāsa*)—is the Self of all and the Subject of all experience, the Lord speaks of Its magnificence, concisely in the (following) four verses.

यदादित्यगतं तेजो जगद्भासयतेऽखिलम् ।
यच्चन्द्रमसि यच्चाग्नौ तत्तेजो विद्धि मामकम् ।। १२ ।।

Yad-Āditya-gatam tejo jagad-bhāsayate(a)khilam
Yac-candramasi yaccāgnau tat-tejo viddhi māmakam

12. That Light which residing in the Sun illumines the entire world, that which is in the Moon, and in Fire,—know that Light to be Mine.

That Light, brilliance, splendour, *which residing in the Sun, illumines*, makes manifest, *the entire world, that* Light *which is in the Moon*, illumining (objects), *and in Fire—know that Light to be Mine*, understand that lustre as belonging to Me, Viṣṇu[28].

Or, (another interpretation is:), the Light of Consciousness which is in the Sun, in the Moon, and in Fire, know that Light to be Mine, that of Viṣṇu[29] (the All-pervading).

Objection:—Surely, the Light of Consciousness exists uniformly in all moving and un-moving objects; why this qualification of 'residing in the Sun', etc.?

28. This interpretation brings out that Brahman, Who is *Cit* (Consciousness) is the Self of all; it is only the Light of Brahman-Intelligence (*Brahma-caitanya-jyotis*), which is present in different places like the Sun, that illumines all objects. (Ā)

29. This interpretation refers Brahman being the Intelligence (*Cit*) in everything since He is Omniscient (*sarvajña*). (Ā)

Reply:—There is nothing wrong here; it is but proper to specifically refer to superior manifestation due to preponderance of *Sattva* (in the Sun etc.). Indeed, in the Sun and the others mentioned, the *Sattva* is extremely brilliant and luminous; therefore, in them alone is the Light .of Brahman-Intelligence) better manifested; and hence the qualification. It is not meant that the Light (of Consciousness) exists in a greater measure in them. To illustrate by an example from common life: although the face is equally in front of all objects, it does not become manifested in a piece of wood, or wall and the like; but in mirrors of varying degrees of purity, it is manifested in a lesser or greater degree.

Also,

गामाविश्य च भूतानि धारयाम्यहमोजसा ।
पुष्णामि चौषधीः सर्वाः सोमो भूत्वा रसात्मकः ॥ १३ ॥

Gāmāviśya ca bhūtāni dhārayamyaham-ojasā
Puṣṇāmi cauṣadhīḥ sarvāḥ somo bhūtva rasātmakaḥ

13. Entering the earth with My energy, I support all beings; and I nourish all herbs, becoming the Moon, who is the repository of vital juices (*rasa*).

Entering, penetrating, *the earth with My energy*, the strength of Īśvara, devoid of desire and attachment (VII.11), which has entered into the earth for supporting the world[30]; and whereby the vast earth neither falls down nor is rent asunder;—as has been sung in the Vedic chants: " By whom heaven is made strong and the earth firm'' (R.V.X. 121.5, Tai. Sam. IV.i.8); "He held the earth firm'' (R.V.X.121.1; Tai. Sam. IV.i.8); and so on. Appropriately, therefore, has it been said that, entering the earth, *I support all beings*, the world, the moving and the un-moving. *And,* besides, *I nourish*, infuse vital juice and sapidity into, *all herbs*, growing on earth, such as rice and wheat, *becoming the Moon who is the repository of cital juices* (rasātmakaḥ): the Moon is composed of all vital juices; he is of the nature of sap; and he is the abundant source

30. i.e. living objects. (A)

of all flavour; it is indeed he who nourishes all herbs by infusing his own "rasa" (essence).

And besides,

अहं वैश्वानरो भूत्वा प्राणिनां देहमाश्रितः ।
प्राणापानसमायुक्तः पचाम्यन्नं चतुर्विधम् ।। १४ ।।

Aham Vaiśvānaro bhūtvā prāṇinām deham-āśritaḥ
Prāṇāpāna-samāyuktaḥ pacāmyannam catur-vidham

14. Abiding in the body of living beings as Vaiśvānara, I, associated with *Prāṇa* and *Apāna*, digest the four-fold food.

Abiding in, entering into, *the body of living beings, as Vaiśvānara*, the fire in the stomach, as said in Śruti: "This fire is Vaiśvānara, that which is within man, and by which this food is digested" (Bṛ.V.ix.1), *I* Myself, *associated with Prāṇa and Apāna*[31], *digest the four-fold food*, i.e. food which has to be eaten (1) by mastication, (2) by swallowing, (3) by sucking, and (4) by licking.

Difilement due to impurity in food will not affect him who considers that the Vaiśvānara fire is the eater, that Soma is the food eaten, and that these two (eater and food), that is, everything, form Fire-Soma[32].

Further,

सर्वस्य चाहं हृदि सन्निविष्टो मत्तः स्मृतिर्ज्ञानमपोहनं च ।
वेदैश्च सर्वैरहमेव वेद्यो वेदान्तकृद्वेदविदेव चाहम् ।। १५ ।।

31. see IV. 29. 'Association' refers to the fire in the stomach being kindled by *Prāṇa*. (Ā)

32. Incidentally, the contemplation of Vaiśvānara in the eater and of Soma in the food, at the time of eating is taught here; and it is stated that to the eater who so contemplates the whole universe, constituting the eater and the food to be Agni-Soma, no defilement caused by (impure) food attaches. (Ā)

Sarvasya cāham hṛdi sanniviṣṭo
mattaḥ smṛtirjñānam-apohanam ca
Vedaiśca sarvair-aham-eva vedyo
vedāntakṛd-veda-vid eva cāham

15. And I am centred in the hearts of all; from Me are memory and perception, as well as their loss. I am verily that which is known by all the Vedas; I am indeed the Author of the Vedanta and the Knower of the Vedas.

And I am centred in the hearts, the buddhi[33], *of all* living beings[34] being their Self; wherefore, *from Me*[35], the Self, *are memory and perception*[36], *as well as their loss*, for all sentient beings. For persons of righteous deeds, memory and perception occur in conformity with their virtuous deeds; similarly, for the sinful, loss of memory and perception occur in the manner appropriate to their sinful actions. *I*, the Supreme Self (Paramātman), *am verily that which is*, has to be, *known by all the Vedas*; *I am indeed the Author of the Vedanta*, i.e. the Propagator of the traditional teaching of the Vedantic Doctrine[37], *and the Knower of the Vedas*, i.e. knower of the (true) meaning of the Vedas.

An epitome of the grandeur of the Blessed Lord, Īśvara, called Nārāyaṇa, as manifested through distinguished *upādhis*[38], has been given in the preceding verses beginning from. "The Light which

33. as the Witness of all that is good and evil in their hearts (buddhi). (Ā)

34. from Brahmā (the Creator) to the termite. (Ā)

35. Who presides over all actions and is the stage-manager (*sūtra-dhāra*) directing the machine (*yantra*) that is the universe. (Ā)

36. 'Memory' is the recollection of what was experienced in past births; 'perception' is the cognition of things remote in space, time, and nature (*svabhāva*). (Ā)

37. thus refuting the possible doubt that the *Vedānta* is the production of the Lord (*pauruṣeyatva*. (Ā). The Vedas (and therefore the Vedanta too) are Self-born and co-eternal with the Lord.

38. such as the Sun. (Ā)

residing in the Sun'' etc. (XV.12 to 15). Now, the following verses set out to declare the true nature of the same (the Lord) who is the Absolute without attributes, as distinct from the *upādhis* known as the 'Perishable' (*Kṣara*) and the 'Imperishable' (*Akṣara*). Therein[39], the Lord groups under three designations all principles which have been taught in the preceding chapters and those which are to be taught in the sequel, and says:

द्वाविमौ पुरुषौ लोके क्षरश्चाक्षर एव च ।
क्षरः सर्वाणि भूतानि कूटस्थोऽक्षर उच्यते ॥ १६ ॥

Dvāvimau puruṣau loke kṣaraścākṣara eva ca
Kṣaraḥ sarvāṇi bhūtāni kūṭastho(a)kṣara ucyate

16. There are two *Puruṣas* in the world, the Perishable and the Imperishable. The Perishable consists of all beings; the *Kūṭastha* (Immutable) is said to be Imperishable.

There are two Puruṣās, two categories, arranged in two separate groups of entities, spoken of as Puruṣas[40], *in the world*, in saṁsāra: *the Perishāble* is one group, consisting of the transient; *and* the other Puruṣa is *the Imperishable*, the opposite of the first, namely the Māyāśaki (Illusion-Power) of the Lord, the germ which brings about the birth of the Puruṣa termed the Perishable and the substratum of the latent impression of the desires, actions, etc.[41] of the various transmigratory creatures: this is said to be the Imperishable Puruṣa. What these two Puruṣas are, the Lord Himself proceeds to specify:

The Perishable consists of all beings, that is to say, the entirety of all products (modifications).

39. The following verses do not merely determine the true nature of the Self which is Absolute: they also set out the aim of the entire *Gītāśāstra*. (Ā)

40. They are not actually *Puruṣa*, but are *spoken of* as such, since they are the *upādhis* of the *Puruṣa*. (Ā)

41. 'etc.' refers to knowledge. (Ā)

The *Kūṭastha* is that which stands un-movable like a heap. Or, 'kūta' means 'illusion', 'deception', 'falsity', 'tortuousness'; and 'kūṭastha' is that which manifests itself in various forms of illusion, deception etc. It (the Kūṭastha) *is said to be the Imperishable*, inasmuch as the seed of saṁsāra is endless[42].

Distinct from these two, the Perishable and the Imperishable, and untouched by the blemishes of the two *upādhis* of the Perishable, and the Imperishable is the (third, and Supreme) Puruṣa, eternal, pure, wise, and free, by nature—

उत्तमः पुरुषस्त्वन्यः परमात्मेत्युदाहृतः ।
यो लोकत्रयमाविश्य बिभर्त्यव्यय ईश्वरः ॥ १७ ॥

Uttamaḥ puruṣastvanyaḥ paramātmetyudāhṛtaḥ
Yo loka-trayam-āviśya bibhartyavyaya Īśvaraḥ

17. But (there is) another, the Supreme Puruṣa, called the Highest Self,—He, the Immutuable Lord, Who pervading the three worlds sustains them.

But there is *another*, absolutely different from these two, *the Supreme*, superlatively eminent, *Puruṣa, called the Highest Self*: He is the highest as compared with those 'selves', such as the body, which are the effects of avidyā; and He is *the Self* as being the Inner Consciousness in all beings; thus He is *called*, spoken of as, *the Highest Self* in the Vedantas (Upaniṣads). That very same Puruṣa is further defined: *He, the Immutable Lord*, the Omniscient Ruler called Nārāyaṇa, *who, pervading*, entering into, *the three worlds*, Bhūḥ (the Earth), Bhuvaḥ (the Mid-Region), and Svaḥ (the Heaven), by the energy of His own might that is Sentiency (caitanya-bala-śakti)[43], *sustains them,* maintains them by simply remaining in them in His true form as the Reality (Existence=Sat-bhāva).

42. because it does not cease, in the absence of Brahma-jñāna. (Ā)

43. 'Sentiency' (*caitanya*) is itself the 'might' (*bala*); and the 'energy (*śākti*) that is present in it is '*Māyā*'. (Ā)

Of the Lord afore-described, 'Purusottama' (the Highest Puruṣa) is a celebrated name. And, while showing by a declaration of its etymology that this name is significant, the Lord makes Himself known, "I am the Unsurpassed Lord"—

यस्मात्क्षरमतीतोऽहमक्षरादपि चोत्तमः ।
अतोऽस्मि लोके वेदे च प्रथितः पुरुषोत्तमः ।। १८ ।।

Yasmāt-kṣaram-atīto(a)ham-akṣarād-api cottamaḥ
Ato(a)smi loke vede ca prathitaḥ Puruṣottamaḥ

18. Wherefore I transcend the Perishable and am above even the Imperishable, therefore am I celebrated in the world and in the Veda as *Puruṣottama* (the Highest *Puruṣa*).

Wherefore I transcend the Perishable, namely the tree that is the illusion of saṁsāra, named Aśvattha, *and am above*, superior in the highest degree to, or farthest beyond, *even the Imperishable* which constitutes the seed of the tree of saṁsāra, *therefore*, because I am superior to both the Perishable and the Imperishable, *am I celebrated*, praised, *in the world and in the Veda as Puruṣottama*, the Highest Purusa. It is thus that the world of devotees knows Me. And poets incorporate this name in their poems and other compositions; they sing My praise by this appellation of "Puruṣottama".

And now, this fruit, which accrues to him who knows the Self as defined above, is stated:

यो मामेवमसंमूढो जानाति पुरुषोत्तमम् ।
स सर्वविद्भजति मां सर्वभावेन भारत ।। १९ ।।

Yo mām-evam-asammūḍho jānāti Puruṣottamam
Sa sarva-vid-bhajati mām sarva-bhāvena Bhārata

19. He who, free from delusion, thus knows Me, the Puruṣottama, he, knowing all, worships Me with his entire being, O Bhārata.

He who, free from delusion[44], *thus,* in the manner described[45], *knows Me*, the Lord as specified above[46], *the Puruṣottama*: i.e. knows Him in this wise: " He I am''; *he, knowing all,* by knowing the Self of all[47], *worships Me* present in all beings, *with his entire being*, engrossed in the contemplation of the Self of all, *O Bhārata.*

Having in this chapter, set forth the knowledge of the true nature of the Lord, which has liberation (*mokṣa*) for its fruit, the Lord now praises it as follows:

इति गुह्यतमं शास्त्रमिदमुक्तं मयाऽनघ ।
एतद्बुद्ध्वा बुद्धिमान्स्यात्कृतकृत्यश्च भारत ॥ २० ॥

Iti guhya-tamam śāstram-idam-uktam mayā(a)nagha
Etad-buddhvā buddhimān-syāt-kṛtakṛtyaśca Bhārata

20. Thus, O sinless one, has his most profound Teaching been imparted by Me. Knowing this, one becomes a man of wisdom, a person who has accomplished his entire duty as well, O Bhārata.

Thus, O sinless one, has this most profound Teaching, extremely secret, to be guarded more carefully than anything else, *been imparted by Me.*

Although the scripture known as the Gītā, in its entirety, is said to be the Teaching (Śāstra, Science), nevertheless, it is evident from the context that this Chapter (XV) itself is declared to be the Śāstra (Teaching), for the purpose of extolling it. Indeed, it is not merely the whole teaching of the Gītā-śāstra that has been briefly stated in this Chapter; the entire import of the Veda has also been finally stated here, as seen from the declarations: "He who knows

44. the idea that the body and the rest are himself and are his possessions. (Ā)

45. as transcending the Perishable and the Imperishable. (Ā)

46. i.e. as being the Self of all, etc. (Ā)

47. It is only the Lord who can be discerned to be the Self of all; hence, he who has known the Lord knows all. (Ā)

it is a Veda-knower" (verse 1); and "I am verily that which is (has to be) known by all the Vedas" (verse 15)[48].

Knowing this Śāstra, exactly as taught above, *one becomes a man of wisdom*; he becomes a *person who has accomplished his entire duty as well, O Bhārata*; but not otherwise. He by whom everything that he ought to do has been fulfilled is (said to be) the man who has accomplished all his duties ("kṛta-kṛtya") ;and whatever duty has to be performed by a Brāhmaṇa of distinguished birth, all that duty becomes discharged when the truth about the Lord (Bhagavad-tattva) has been realised—this is the meaning. The import is that in no other way can anybody discharge his duty completely. And it has been so declared, "All action, in its entirety, O Pārtha, attains its consummation in Knowledge" (IV.33). We have also the declaration of Manu[49], which runs thus: " This indeed is the fulfilment of birth, especially for a Brāhmaṇa; for, by attainment of this does the twice-born become a kṛta-kṛtya, and not otherwise " .M.S. XII.93).

Because you have heard from Me this truth concerning the Supreme Reality, therefore are you a blessed man (kṛtārtha), O Bhārata.

'इति श्री महाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्यां
भीष्मपर्वणि श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु
ब्रह्मविद्यायां योगशास्त्रे श्रीकृष्णार्जुन-
संवादे पुरुषोत्तमयोगो नाम
पञ्चदशोऽध्यायः ॥

48. Its (the Teaching in this Chapter) title to be called a *Sāstra* is not derived merely by its being an epitome of the entire teaching of the *Gitā-Śāstra*,; it is but proper to designate it a *Śāstra*, because the whole teaching of the Veda as well is concluded herein. (Ā)

49. Manu is considered to be a supreme authority in spiritual matters, as the Vedic saying goes: "Whatever Manu has said, that is the cure (for man's) ills)."

Iti Śrī Mahābhārate śata-sāhasryām saṁhitāyām Vaiyāsikyām Bhīṣma-Parvaṇi Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītāsūpaniṣatsu Brahmavidyāyām yoga śāstre Śri Kṛṣṇārjuna Sāmvāde Purusottama-yoga nāma pañcadaśo(a)dhyāyaḥ.

Thus, the fifteenth chapter entitled 'Way to the Supreme Spirit' in the Upaniṣads known as 'The Celebrated Songs of the Lord' expounding the Knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna—embodied in the Bhīṣma Parva of Śrī Mahābhārata, the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyāsa.

॥ षोडशोऽध्यायः ॥

(दैवासुरसंपद्विभागयोगः)

ṢOḌAŚO(A)DHYĀYAḤ

(DAIVĀSURA–SAMPATI–VIBHĀGA–YOGAḤ)

CHAPTER – XVI

(THE MODE OF DIVIDING DIVINE AND DEMONAIC PROPERTIES)

In the Ninth Chapter were indicated three (different) natures belonging to sentient beings,namely, the Divine, the *Āsuric* (demoniac) and the *Rākṣasic* (devilish) IX, 12 and 13). With a view to explaining them in full, the (present) Chapter commencing with the worlds, "Fearlessness, purity of heart" is begun. Of these, the Divine nature makes for liberation from *saṁsāra*, while the *Āsuric* and the *Rākṣasic* lead to bondage. And so, they are being explained, in order that the Divine may be acquired and the other two given up.[1]

श्री भगवानुवाच —

अभयं सत्त्वसंशुद्धिर्ज्ञानयोगव्यवस्थितिः ।
दानं दमश्च यज्ञश्च स्वाध्यायस्तप आर्जवम् ॥ १ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca

Abyayam sattva-samśuddhir-jñāna-yoga-vyavasthitiḥ
Dānam damaśca yajñāśca svādhyāyas-tapa ārjavam

1. The latent impressions (*vāsanās*), inferable from actions, and spoken of in XV.2 as the secondary roots of the tree of *saṁsāra*, manifest themselves in the bodies of men, in accordance with the *karma* of previous births, in the three natures (*prakṛti*)—Divine and the rest, respectively the *sāttvic*, the *rājasic* and the *tāmasic*. (Ā)

The Blessed Lord said—

1. Fearlessness, purity of heart, steadfastness in knowledge and *Yoga*, giving away in charity, self-restraint, *yajña*, study of one's own Scriptures, austerity, uprightness;

(The sentence is completed in verse 3).

Fearlessness, absence of timidity (i.e. courage)[2]; *purity of heart*, purity of the inner-organ (antaḥ-karaṇa), abandonment of deception[3], dissimulation[4], falsehood[5], and the like[6],—that is to say, conducting oneself in his affairs with honesty; *steadfastness in knowledge*, in the understanding of the signification of matters such as the Self from Scripture and the teacher, *and* in *Yoga*, in making what has been so understood become the object of personal experience, by one-pointed attention through withdrawal of the senses etc. This[7] constitutes the Divine of Sāttvic sampad[8], of the first rank.

And whatever disposition among those menioned happens to be found in persons having the duty of follow a particular path, that is spoken of as the sāttvic nature of persons in that path[9].

2. (*Abhīrutā*); steadfastness in carrying out the teachings of scripture without entertaining doubts. (Ā)

3. (*para-vañcanam*) bringing others under influence through trickery. (Ā)

4. (*māyā*) intending one thing at heart and externally behaving differently. (Ā)

5. (*anṛta*) making statement not in conformity with what was observed. (Ā)

6. This includes *vipralambha*, deceiving by false statements or by not keeping promises. (Ā)

7. i.e. the three-fold lot comprising fearlessness, purity of heart, and steadfastness in knowledge and *Yoga*. (Ā)

8. '*Sampad*' means: the endowment, lot, assets, affluence, wealth, fortune, property, attributes, nature, state, estate, disposition.

9. Whether they have the duty to follow the Path of Knowledge or the Path of Action, the disposition of being fearless, etc., constitutes the divine lot in that Path. Having stated what divine attributes of the highest kind fall to the most blessed, the Lord proceeds to mention what divine attributes can possibly be found in all persons (in what follows). (Ā)

Giving away in charity, sharing food and the like, as far as possible; *self-restraint*, control of the external senses,—the control of the internal sense (tranquillity through sense control) being mentioned later (in verse 2); *Yajña*, that enjoined by Śruti such as the agni-hotra (fire-worship), as also that enjoined by Smṛti, namely worship of the gods (Deva-yajña) and the rest[10]; *study of one's own Scriptures*, the Ṛg-Veda and the like, for securing results unseen; *austerity*, penances relating to the body, etc., which will hereafter be mentioned (Chap. XVII); *uprightness*, rectitude at all times:

Also,

अहिंसा सत्यमक्रोधस्त्यागः शान्तिरपैशुनम् ।
दया भूतेष्वलोलुप्त्वं मार्दवं ह्रीरचापलम् ॥ २ ॥

Ahiṁsā satyam-akrodhas-tyāgaḥ śāntir-apaiśunam
Dayā bhūteṣvaloluptvam mārdavam hrīr-acāpalam

2. Non-injuriousness, truth, absence of rage, renunciation, tranquility (through sense control), absence of calumny, compassion to beings, non-covetousness, gentleness, modesty, absence of fickleness;

Non-injuriousness, abstaining from causing harm to living beings; *truth*, speaking of things in accordance with facts, avoiding what is unpleasant and false; *absence of rage*, stopping of anger arising when caluminated for beaten by others) *renunciation*, saṁnyāsa, (and not just 'giving up' possession in charity,) since (such) 'giving away' has already been mentioned (v.1); *tranquillity*, calmness of mind (antaḥ-karaṇa); *absence of calumny*, desisting from publicising to third persons the weak points of others; *compassion*, kindness, pity *to beings*, in distress; *non-covetousness*, maintaining the sense-organs unperturbed in the presence of their (respective) objects; *gentleness*, the absence of hard-heartedness; *modesty*,

10. Worship of the manes (*Pitr-yajña*), of all created beings (*bhūta-yajña*) and of men (*manusya-yajña*) are meant; since *Brahma-yajña* (study of one's own scriptures) is separately referred to. (Ā)

bashfulness; *absence of fickleness*, non-exercise of the functions of speech, hands, feet, etc., when there is no purpose;

And also—

तेजः क्षमा धृतिः शौचमद्रोहो नातिमानिता ।
भवन्ति संपदं दैवीमभिजातस्य भारत ॥ ३ ॥

Tejaḥ kṣamā dhṛtiḥ śaucam-adroho nātimānitā
Bhavanti sampadam daivīm-abhijātasya Bhārata

3. Energy, forgiveness, fortitude, purity, absence of hatred, absence of pride;—these belong to one born for a divine lot, O Bhārata.

("Tejas": ((lustre" means) *Energy*, boldness, and not the brightness of the skin)

Forgiveness, absence of the rise of passion in the mind when caluminiated or beaten. We have explained 'absence of rage' as the stopping of anger after it has arisen; 'forgiveness' and 'absence of rage' are thus to be distinguished;

Fortitude, that special state of the mind (antaḥ-karaṇā) which drives away the exhaustion of the body and the senses when they get fatigued, and propped up by which the senses and the body will not droop;

Purity, of the two kinds; the external, that produced by means of earth and water; and the internal, the cleanliness of the mind and the heart (buddhi), constituting absence of dissimulation, attachment, and such other defilements; thus is purity of two sorts;

Absence of hatred, absence of the desire to harm others, non-injury;

Absence of pride: pride consists in having an exalted opinion of one-self (ati-māna); absence of pride denotes freedom from the thought that oneself is worthy of superior respect

These, from 'fearlessness' to 'absence of ride', *belong to one born for a divine lot*, one born marked for the properties of

the devas (gods), that is to say, one who is worthy of the glory of devas,who is destined to be blessed,—*O Bhārata.*

And now is described the lot that is āsuric (demoniac):

दम्भो दर्पोऽभिमानश्च क्रोधः पारुष्यमेव च ।
अज्ञानं चाभिजातस्य पार्थ संपदमासुरीम् ॥ ४ ॥

Dambho darpo(a)timānaśca krodhaḥ pāruṣyam-eva ca
Ajñnāam cābhijātasya Pārtha sampadam-āsurīm

4. Ostentation, arrogance, and self-conceit, anger, as also harshness, and ignorance, belong to one who is born, O Pārtha, for a demoniac lot.

Ostentation, religious hypocrisy[11]; *arrogance*, insolence, due to learning, wealth, relations, etc. *and self-conceit*, already explained[12]; *anger as also harshness*, insolence in speech, such as describing a blind man as one with good eye-sight, an ugly person as being handsome, a man of low birth as one of high lineage, and so on; *and ignorance*, the kind of understanding which is lacking in judgment, misconception with regard to what ought to be done and what should not be done; *these , O Pārtha, belong to one who is born for a demoniac lot*, for the estate of Asuras.

The effects of these two lots is being stated:

दैवी संपद्विमोक्षाय निबन्धायासुरी मता ।
मा शुचः संपदं दैवीमभिजातोऽसि पाण्डव ॥ ५ ॥

Daivī sampad-vimokṣāya nibandhāyāsurī matā
Mā śucaḥ sampadam daivīm-abhijāto(a)si Pāṇḍava

5. The divine lot is deemed for liberation, the demoniac for bondage. Grieve not, O Pāṇḍava, you are born for a divine lot.

11. '*dharma-dhvajitvam*': literally, hoisting the flag of religion; that is to say, showing off one's religiosity. See v.17.

12. vide 'absence of pride' in v. 3.

What forms *the divine lot*, that *is deemed for liberation* from the bondage of saṁsāra; *the demoniac* lot (state) is deemed to make *for* certain *bondage*) so also the Rākṣasic (fiendish).

In the context of the pronouncement thus made, observing Arjuna's inward feeling, in the form of the reflection, "Am I furnished with āsuric properties, or endowed with divine properties?", the Lord says: "*Grieve not*, *you are born*, marked, *for a divine lot*, that is to say, you are destined for blessedness, *O Pāṇḍava*".

द्वौ भूतसर्गौ लोकेऽस्मिन् दैव आसुर एव च ।
दैवो विस्तरशः प्रोक्त आसुरं पार्थ मे शृणु ॥ ६ ॥

Dvau hhūta-sargau loke(a)smin daiva āsura eva ca
Daivo vistaraśaḥ prokta āsuram Partha me śṛṇu

6. There are two creations of beings in this world, the divine and the demoniac. The divine has been described at length; hear from Me, O Pārtha, of the demoniac.

There are two creations of beings: two-fold in number is the classification of those that are created, namely men, *in this world*, i.e. transmigratory existence (saṁsāra). The men who are created with the two kinds of nature, *the divine and the demoniac*, are said to be 'the creations', according to the Śruti, "Verily there are two classes of Prajāpati's descendants, Devas and Asuras" (Bṛ.I.iii.1.). All beings are included in these two classes[13].

What are the two creations of beings? These are just those under discussion, namely, the divine and the demoniac. The object of repeating again the same two (creations) that have already been mentioned is stated: *The divine* creation of beings *has been described at length*, in an extensive manner, beginning with the words, "Fearlessness, purity of heart" etc.) but the demoniac has not been described at length; therefore, in order that you may give it up, do you, *O Pārtha, hear from Me of*, understand from My words, *the demoniac*, which will be described at length.

13. The '*sampad*' of Rākṣasas, who are extremely cruel, does not form a third class; it is included in the *āsuric* (demoniac). (Ā) See also Com. on verse 5; and note 14, Chap. IX12.

The demoniac lot is set out, up to the end of this chapter, as forming the attribute of (some) living beings (i.e. men); because, only when it is explicitly known will it be possible to avoid it:

प्रवृत्तिं च निवृत्तिं च जना न विदुरासुराः ।
न शौचं नापि चाचारो न सत्यं तेषु विद्यते ॥ ७ ॥

Pravṛttim ca nivṛttim ca janā na vidur-āsurāḥ
Na śaucam nāpi cācāro na satyam teṣu vidyate.

7. Action, as also inaction, the demoniac men do not know; neither purity, nor (good) conduct, nor truth, is found in them.

Action, i.e. right activity, that which should be engaged in, as being the means of achieving the ends of human life. Puruṣārtha)' *as also* its opposite, *inaction*, i.e. right inactivity, that which should be desisted from, as productive of harm, *the demoniac men do not know*—, do not understand (learn). Not merely are they ignorant of what to do and what not to do; *neither purity* (*good*) *conduct, nor truths is found in them*; the demoniac people are, indeed, impure and of improper conduct, hypocrites and liars.

Also,

असत्यमप्रतिष्ठं ते जगदाहुरनीश्वरम् ।
अपरस्परसंभूतं किमन्यत्कामहैतुकम् ॥ ८ ॥

Asatyam-apratiṣṭham te jagad-āhur-anīśvaram
Aparaspara-sambhūtam kim-anyat-kāma-haitukam

8. They say, "The universe is without truth, without a basis, without a God, brought about by mutual union, with lust for its cause; what else?"

They, the demoniac people, *say*, "*The universe is without truth*, unreal, even as we are without truth and false; *without a basis*, neither do dharma and adharma form its basis; and therefore it has no basis either) *without a God*, there is no Īśvara ruling over

it in accordance with dharma and adharma''; and so, they say that the universe is without a God. "Moreover, the entire universe is *brought about by mutual union* of woman and man, prompted by lust; it has therefore only *lust for its cause*; *what else can be* the cause of the universe? There is no other cause whatever, invisible, such as dharma and adharma. Carnal gratification is alone the cause of all living beings'': such is the view of the Lokāyatikas (materialists; atheists).

एतां दृष्टिमवष्टभ्य नष्टात्मानोऽल्पबुद्धयः ।
प्रभवन्त्युग्रकर्माणः क्षयाय जगतोऽहिताः ॥ ९ ॥

Etām dṛṣṭim-avaṣṭabhya naṣṭātmāno(a)lpa-buddhayaḥ
Prabhavantyugra-karmāṇaḥ kṣayāya jagato(a)hitāḥ

9. Holding this view, these ruined souls, of little wit, of fierce deeds, rise as the enemies of the world for its destruction.

Holding, practising *this view, these ruined souls,* with their (human) nature destroyed, and deprived of the means of going to higher worlds, *of little wit,* whose intellects are narrow, being concerned only with the (paltry) objects of the senses, *of fierce deeds*, naturally disposed to injure and kill, *rise*, spring up, *as the enemies*, destroyers, *of the world*[14], *for its destruction.*

They are also thus:

काममाश्रित्य दुष्पूरं दम्भमानमदान्विताः ।
मोहाद्गृहीत्वाऽसद्ग्राहान्प्रवर्तन्तेऽशुचिव्रताः ॥ १० ॥

Kāmam-āśritya duṣpūram dambhamāna-madānvitāḥ
Mohād-gṛhītvā(a)sadgrāhān-pravartante(a)śuci-vratāḥ

10. Resorting to insatiable desires, possessed of

14. all living creatures. (A)

hypocrisy, pride, and arrogance, holding improper resolves through delusion, they set about their work with unholy determination.

Resorting, holding on, *to insatiable desires*, peculiar wishes hard of fulfilment, *possessed of hypocrisy, pride, and arrogance, holding*, taking, *improper resolves*, unwholesome decisions, *through delusion*, lack of judgment, *they set about their work* in the world *with unholy determination*, wicked resolve.

Moreover,

चिन्तामपरिमेयां च प्रलयान्तामुपाश्रिताः ।
कामोपभोगपरमा एतावदिति निश्चिताः ॥ ११ ॥

Cintām-aparimeyām ca pralayāntām-upāśritāḥ
Kāmopabhoga-paramā etāvad-iti niścitāḥ

11. Giving themselves upto immense cares ending only with death, with the gratification of desire for their highest aim, and feeling sure that this is all;

(The sentence is completed in the next verse.)

Giving themselves upto immense cares ending only with death, cares whose limit is incapable of measurement[15], that is to say, always full of anxiety, *with the gratification of desire*, the enjoyment of objects of desire, such as sound and the rest, *for their highest aim, and feeling sure that this*, the gratification of desire, *is all*, is the supreme end of man (puruṣārtha[16]):

आशापाशशतैर्बद्धाः कामक्रोधपरायणाः ।
ईहन्ते कामभोगार्थमन्यायेनार्थसञ्चयान् ॥ १२ ॥

15. Their cares, which take the form of surveying the means of gaining and preserving what they desire, relate to innumerable objects of desire, and thus are immeasurable. (Ā)

16. (To them) this gratification of desires is the supreme road to happiness; (and) there is no such thing as happiness pertaining to another world (after-life). (Ā)

Āśā-pāśa-śatair-baddhāḥ kāma-krodha-parāyaṇāḥ
Īhante kāma-bhogārtham-anyāyenārtha-sañcayān

12. bound by hundreds of ties of expectation, given over to lust and wrath, they strive to secure by unjust means hoards of wealth for sensual enjoyment.

bound by hundreds of ties of expectation: false hopes are the ties; drawn on all sides, being by bound hundreds of such ties[17]; *given over to lust and wrath*, betaking themselves to lust and wrath as the best resort, *they strive to secure*, endeavour to obtain, *by unjust means*, such as taking away others' belonging, *hoards of wealth*, *for* being utilised on *sensual enjoyment*, not for (performing acts of) dharma.

Their aim takes this form:

इदमद्य मया लब्धमिदं प्राप्स्ये मनोरथम् ।
इदमस्तीदमपि मे भविष्यति पुनर्धनम् ॥ १३ ॥

Idam-adya mayā labdham-idam prāpsye manoratham
Idam-astīdam-api me bhaviṣyati punar-dhanam

13. "This to-day has been gained by me; this desire I shall obtain; this is mine; and this wealth also shall be mine again (in future).

(The sentence is completed in V. 16).

This wealth[18] *has been gained by me to-day*, now; *this desire*, quite another, which will produce mental satisfaction, *I shall obtain*; and, *this is mine; and this wealth also shall be mine again*, in the coming year, and consequently I shall become famous as a wealthy person.

17. They cherish vain desire for objects, the means to secure which are either beyond their capacity or are unknown to them; these hopes, in their hundreds, are like fetters; and, bound by them, as it were, they fall from virtue and are led astray. (Ā)

18. such as cattle and gold. (Ā)

असौ मया हतः शत्रुर्हनिष्ये चापरानपि ।
ईश्वरोऽहमहं भोगी सिद्धोऽहं बलवान्सुखी ॥ १४ ॥

Asau mayā hataḥ śatrur-haniṣye cāparān-api
Īśvaro(a)ham-aham bhogī siddho(a)ham balavān-sukhī

14. "That enemy has been slain by me; and I shall slay others as well; I am lord, I enjoy, I am successful, powerful, and happy.

"*That unconquerable enemy*. Devadatta by name, *has been slain by me*; *and I shall slay others*, wretched fellows, *as well*; what can these pitiable men do? There is none equal to me in any respect. *I am lord, I enioy, I am successful* in every way, blessed with sons, grand-sons and great-grandsons; I am not an ordinary man. I alone am *powerful and happy*[19]; the rest are born (merely) as a burden to the earth.

आढ्योऽभिजनवानस्मि कोऽन्योऽस्ति सदृशो मया ।
यक्ष्ये दास्यामि मोदिष्य इत्यज्ञानविमोहिताः ॥ १५ ॥

Aḍhyo(a)bhijanavān-asmi ko(a)nyo(a)sti sadṛśo mayā
Yakṣye dāsyāmi modiṣya ityajñana-vimohitāḥ

15. "I am rich and well-born, Who else is equal to me? I will sacrifice, I will give, I will rejoice". Thus deluded by ignorance, (and)

"*I am rich* through my wealth, *and* by descent *well-born*, in a family learned in the Veda and other scriptures for seven generations and with similar blessings; *who else is equal to me*, even in these respects?—there is none equal to me. Moreover, *I will sacrifice*, I shall excel others even in (the performance of) sacrifices

19. free from infirmity (*roga*), healthy. (Ā)

(yāgas), *I will give* wealth to dancers and actors, and *I will rejoice*, obtain pleasure of the highest kind''. *Thus deluded by ignorance*, falling in this manner into diverse ways of thinking, wanting in judgment, (and)

अनेकचित्तविभ्रान्ता मोहजालसमावृताः ।
प्रसक्ताः कामभोगेषु पतन्ति नरकेऽशुचौ ॥ १६ ॥

Aneka-citta-vibhrāntā moha-jāla-samāvṛtāḥ
Prasaktāḥ kāma-bhogeṣu patanti narake(a)śucau

16. bewildered by many fancy, encompassed by (entangled in) the snare of delusion, addicted to the gratification of desires, they fall into a foul hell.

bewildered by many a fancy, of the variety stated above; *encompassed by the snare of delusion*: delusion, lack of judgment ignorance, is itself like a snare, inasmuch as it is of the nature of an enclosure; encompassed by (entangled in) it; *addicted to the gratification of desires*,—remaining fixed in this condition alone and thereby ever adding to their store of sins, *they fall into a foul hell*, such as Vaitaraṇi.[20]

आत्मसंभाविताः स्तब्धा धनमानमदान्विताः ।
यजन्ते नामयज्ञैस्ते दम्भेनाविधिपूर्वकम् ॥ १७ ॥

Ātma-sambhāvitāḥ stabdhā dhana-māna-madānvitāḥ
Yajante nāma-yajñais-te dambhenāvidhi-pūrvakam

17. Self-honoured, stubborn, filled with pride and intoxication of wealth, they perform sacrifices in name, out of ostentation, disregarding (scriptural) rule.

Self-honoured, esteemed by their own selves, as possessed of all meritorious qualities, and not by virtuous people; *stubborn*,

20. river of hell.

not of a humble (courteous) nature; *filed with pride and intoxication* on account *of* (their) *wealth*; *they perform sacrifices in name* only, *out of ostentation*, religious hypocrisy[21], *disregarding* (*scriptural*) *rule*, leaving out parts and auxiliaries and neglecting the mode of performance, prescribed by scripture.

अहंकारं बलं दर्पं कामं क्रोधं च संश्रिताः ।
मामात्मपरदेहेषु प्रद्विषन्तोऽभ्यसूयकः ।। १८ ।।

Ahaṁkāram balam darpam kāmam krodham ca saṁśritāḥ
Mām-ātma-para-deheṣu pradviṣanto (a) bhyasūyakāḥ

18. Given over to egotism, power, arrogance, lust and anger, these calumniators hate Me in their own and others' bodies.

Given over to egotism, the sense of self, through which one prides himself as a person endowed with worthy qualities—those. which are found in him, as also those which are not present in him—which he falsely attributes to himself; this egotism is what is called avidyā (spiritual ignorance), the most difficult thing (to abandon)[22] the root-cause of all evil and of all harmful propensities)

So also to *power*, accompanied with lust and passion, and employed in humiliating others;

To *arrogance*, a particular morbid feeling, seated in the antaḥ-karaṇa, on the rise of which one transgresses virtue (dharma);

To *lust*, for sense-objects, such as woman, *and anger*, towards things unpleasant;

They are given over to these and other great vices[23].

21. (*dharma-dhvajitvam*). See Com. on V. 4 and note 11.

22. Even those who possess discrimination have to make extreme efforts to get rid of it. (Ā)

23. such as envy, malice (*mātsarya*). (Ā)

Moreover, they, *these calumniators hate Me*, the Lord, abiding *in their own and others' bodies* as the Witness of their thoughts and actions. To transgress My commands[24] is to hate Me. Behaving in such manner, these calumniators (malicious persons) are intolerant of the virtues of those who abide in the right path.

तानहं द्विषतः क्रूरान्संसारेषु नराधमान् ।
क्षिपाम्यजस्रमशुभानासुरीष्वेव योनिषु ॥ १९ ॥

Tān-aham dviṣataḥ krūrān-saṁsāreṣu naradhamān
Kṣipāmyajasram-aśubhān-āsurīṣveva yoniṣu

19. These malicious and cruel (persons), the most degraded of men,—I hurl these evil-doers, perpetually, into the wombs of Asuras only, in these worlds.

All *these persons*, who are hostile to the path of virtue (the right path) and haters of the virtuous, as also of Myself, (and thus) *malicious and cruel, the most degraded of men*:—because they are steeped in unrighteousness (adharma), *I hurl these evil doers*, who engage themselves in sinful actions, *perpetually*, continually, *into the wombs of Asuras only*, into the wombs of the most cruel beings, such as tigers, lions, and the like, *in these worlds* in the paths of saṁsāra, passing through many a hell.

आसुरीं योनिमापन्ना मूढा जन्मनि जन्मनि ।
मामप्राप्यैव कौन्तेय ततो यान्त्यधमां गतिम् ॥ २० ॥

Āsurīm yonim-āpannā mūḍhā janmani janmani
Mām-aprāpyaiva Kaunteya tato yāntyadhamām gatim

20. Obtaining the demoniac wombs, these deluded beings, in birth after birth, positively failing to reach

24. The Lord's commands are in the form of *Śruti* and *Smṛti*; not caring to know and follow what is taught in them amounts to transgression of the Lord's commands. (Ā)

Me, O son of Kuntī, fall into a condition still lower than that.

Obtaining the demoniac wombs, these deluded beings, bereft of discrimination, being born *in birth after birth* only in predominantly tāmasic wombs, and suffering downfall, *positively failing to reach Me,* the Īśvara, *O son of Kuntī, fall into a condition* which is *still lower,* more despicable, *than that* in which they are. There is certainly no room whatsoever even for a supposition that they will ever attain to Me; 'positively failing to reach Me' therefore means: 'without ever moving towards the right (virtuous) path ordained by Me.'[25]

Now follows this summary of the whole lot of *āsuric* endowments, which is of three forms, in which the entire variety of āsuric nature, though endless, is comprised. And this triad, the root of all calamity, which being avoided the entire variety is got rid of is thus stated:

त्रिविधं नरकस्येदं द्वारं नाशनमात्मनः ।
कामः क्रोधस्तथा लोभस्तस्मादेतत्त्रयं त्यजेत् ।। २१ ।।

Trividham narakasyedam dvāram nāśanam-ātmanaḥ
Kāmaḥ krodhas-tathā lobhas-tasmād-etat-trayam tyajet

21. Triple is this gate of hell, destructive of the self,—lust, anger, and greed; therefore, one should forsake these three.

25. Persons of *āsuric* disposition can never attain to the Lord; and there is therefore no need to deny a supposition that they ever can; hence the interpretation given.

The import of this section is this: The *āsuric* endowments, occasioning a succession of evils, stands in the way of all *puruṣārthas*) therefore, man should, even while he is a free agent (in human birth), and not (yet) fallen into a (lower) birth where he is inevitably deprived of freedom of action, shun it and get rid of it. (Ā)

Triple, three-fold, *is this gate of hell*, i.e. the gate leading to hell, *destructive of the self*: by merely entering at this gate, the self is ruined, i.e. becomes unfit for securing any human end (*puruṣārtha*) whatever; and so the triad is spoken of as the door that destroys the self. What is it? *Lust, anger, and greed.* Since this gate is ruinous to the self, *therefore, one should forsake these three*, lust and the rest.

This is in praise of their avoidance[26]:

एतैर्विमुक्तः कौन्तेय तमोद्वारैस्त्रिभिर्नरः ।
आचरत्यात्मनः श्रेयस्ततो याति परां गतिम् ॥ २२ ॥

Etair-vimuktaḥ Kaunteya tamodvārais-tribhir-naraḥ
Ācaratyātmanaḥ śreyas-tato yāti parām gatim

22. The man who has quitted these three gates of darkness, O son of Kuntī, practises what is good for himself, and thus goes to the Goal Supreme.

The man who has quitted these three gates of darkness, the doors leading to hell, which is full of evil, and delusion, namely, lust and the rest, *O son of Kuntī, practises,—What* (does he practise)?—that which *is good for himself*; he takes to such practice, because that[27] by which hindered till then he could not so practise has disappeared; *and thus*, by so doing, *goes to the Goal Supreme*, he does attain mokṣa (liberation) also[28].

With respect to all this,—the relinquishment of demoniac nature and the practice of what is good,—the basis is Scripture (Śāstra); for, it is only because there is the authority of Scripture that both these courses can be adopted and not otherwise.

26. By forsaking lust etc., the disastrous evil (of delusion) disappears, as also the impediments to the attainment of one's own good. (Ā)

27. lust and the rest. (see note 26).

28. The word "also" indicates that a person, who relinquishes the demoniac nature and practises what is good for himself, does attain not only *mokṣa* through Plenary, Wisdom, but worldly happiness as well. (Ā)

Therefore—

यः शास्त्रविधिमुत्सृज्य वर्तते कामकारतः ।
न स सिद्धिमवाप्नोति न सुखं न परां गतिम् ॥ २३ ॥

Yaḥ śāstra-vidhim-utsṛjya vartate kāma-kārataḥ
Na sa siddhim-avāpnoti na sukham na parām gatim

23. He who, setting aside the ordinance of the Śāstra, acts under the impulse of desire, attains not to perfection, nor happiness, nor the Goal Supreme.

He who, setting aside, going away from, *the ordinance of the Śāstra*, known as injunctions and prohibitions, which form the basis for the knowledge of what ought to be done and what ought not to be done, *acts under the impulse of desire*, being driven on by (his own) desire (or will), *attains not to perfection*, does not secure the competence to achieve any end of man (puruṣārtha), *nor happiness* in this world, *nor the Goal Supreme*, Svarga or Mokṣa (as the case may be).

तस्माच्छास्त्रं प्रमाणं ते कार्याकार्यव्यवस्थितौ ।
ज्ञात्वा शास्त्रविधानोक्तं कर्म कर्तुमिहार्हसि ॥ २४ ॥

Tasmācchastram pramāṇam te kāryākārya-vyavasthitau
Jñātva śāstra-vidhānoktam karma kartum-ihārhasi

24. So, let the *Śāstra* be your authority in ascertaining what ought to be done and what ought not to be done. Having known what is said in the ordinance of the Śāstra as to .your) duty, it behoves you to perform (that) here.

So, let the Śastra be your authority, source of knowledge, *in ascertaining what ought to be done and what ought not to be done.*

Therefore, *having known what is said in the ordinance of the Śāstra*, what is stated therein, indicating: "you shall engage in this act," "you shall not engage in this act", *as to* your appropriate *duty* ("sva-karma")[29], *it behoves you to perform* that *here*. The word 'here' points to the situation wherein the duty to perform action (karma-adhikāra) exists.

इति श्री महाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्यां
भीष्मपर्वणि श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु
ब्रह्मविद्यायां योगशास्त्रे श्रीकृष्णार्जुन-
संवादे दैवासुरसंपद्विभागयोगो नाम
षोडशोऽध्यायः ॥

Iti Śrī Mahābhārate śatasāhasryām saṁhitāyām Vaiyāsikyām Bhīṣma-Parvaṇi Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītāsūpaniṣatsu Brahmavidyāyām yoga-śāstre Śrī Kṛṣṇārjuna-samvāde Daivāsura-sampat-vibhāga-yogo nāma ṣoḍaśo(a)dhyāyaḥ.

Thus the sixteenth chapter entitled 'The Mode of Dividing Divine and Demoniac Properties' in the Upaniṣads known as 'The Celebrated Songs of the Lord'—expounding the knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between Śrī Kṛtṣṇa and Arjuna embodied in the Bhīṣma Parva of Śrī Mahābhārata, the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyāsa.

29. which for a kṣatriya (like Arjuna) is fighting and the like. (Ā)

॥ सप्तदशोऽध्यायः ॥
(श्रद्धात्रयविभाग योगः)

SAPTADAŚO(A)DHYĀYAḤ

(*ŚRADDHĀ–TRAYA–VIBHĀGA–YOGAḤ*)

CHAPTER - XVII

(THE MODE OF DIVISION OF THE THREE KINDS OF FAITH)

From the Lord's words, "So, let the *Śāstra* be your authority" (XVI, 24') finding an occasion for (further) questioning[1].

अर्जुन उवाच —
ये शास्त्रविधिमुत्सृज्य यजन्ते श्रद्धयान्विताः ।
तेषां निष्ठा तु का कृष्ण सत्त्वमाहो रजस्तमः ॥ १ ॥

Arjuna uvāca—

Ye śāstra-vidhim-utsṛjya yajante śraddhayānvitāḥ
Teṣām niṣṭhā tu kā Kṛṣṇa sattvam-āho rajas-tamaḥ

Arjuna said—

1. Those who, setting aside the ordinance of the *Śāstra*, worship with *śraddhā* (faith),—what is the condition of them, *O* Kṛṣṇa? (Is it) *sattva*, or *rajas*, or *tamas*?

Those, i.e. the ordinary men, *who, setting aside*, letting alone. *the ordinance of the Śāstra*, the procedure enjoined by Scriptures,

1. The future lots of believers and non-believers, i.e., persons who, knowing the view-point of the Scriptures, do or do not have faith in their teachings, —have been described (in Chap. XVI). Now, Arjuna proceeds to question, with a view to knowing the fate of believers who are not acquainted with the Scriptures. (Ā)

the Śruti and the Smṛti, *worship with śraddha*, adore the gods, and others with faith, with belief in God and another world beyond:—

Those who do not know of any specific procedure enjoined by Scripture i.e., as described in the Śruti or Smrti, they who, merely from observing the established practice of the learned (the venerable) and being endued with śraddhā, worship the gods and others, are understood by the description, "those who setting aside the ordinance of the Śāstra worship with śraddhā". They, on the other hand, who while knowing of some specific injunction of Scripture set it aside and worship the gods and others, contravening the prescribed procedure, are not to be understood by the said description. Why? Because of the qualification of 'being endued with śraddhā'. It is indeed not possible to imagine that they, who are quite āware of some specific scriptural injunction as to the worship of gods (and others) and yet set it aside irreverently, can be said to engage in the worship of the gods (and others) prescribed by scripture, with the disposition of 'being endued with śraddhā'[2]. Therefore, it is only that class of persons who have been referred to at first that has to be understood here by the description stated.

Of them, thus described, *O Kṛṣṇa*, what is the condition, position? Is it *sattva, or* is it *rajas, or* else, *tamas*? This is what is meant: the worship which is offered by them to gods and others, is it of the sāttvic nature, or of the rājasic nāture, or of the tamasic nature?

Feeling that this question of a general range cannot fittingly be answered without classification of the several aspects,

श्री भगवानुवाच —

त्रिविधा भवति श्रद्धा देहिनां सा स्वभावजा ।

सात्त्विकी राजसी चैव तामसी चेति तां शृणु ॥ २ ॥

2. Because of their slighting the scriptural injunctions which they know of, and engaging in the worship of gods and others according to their fancy, they are to be classed as *asuras*, as settled in the previous chapter (V. 23). (Ā)

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca—

Trividhā bhavati śraddhā dehinām sā svabhāvajā
Sāttvikī rājasī caiva tāmasī ceti tām śṛṇu

The Blessed Lord said—

2. Three fold is the *śraddhā* of the embodied, which is inherent in their nature,—the *sāttvic*, the *rājasic*, and the *tāmasic*. Do you hear of it.

Threefold, of three sorts, *is the śraddhā*, about whose condition you have questioned, *of the embodied*, souls (clad in bodies), *which is inherent in their nature*, which is born of their individual nature (svabhāva), i.e. the self-reproductive latent impressions (saṁskāra) of acts, good and bad (dharma etc.), done in past births, and manifested at the time of death;

The sāttvic, which is concerned with the worship of gods and the like, the effect of Sattva, *the rājasik*, which is concerned with the worship of Yakṣas, Rākṣasas, and the like, the effect of Rajas, *and the tāmasic*, which is concerned with the worship of the Pretas, Piśācas[3], and the like, the effect of Tamas; it is thus threefold

Do you hear of it, the śraddhā, which is about to be described

It is threefold in this manner:

सत्त्वानुरूपा सर्वस्य श्रद्धा भवति भारत ।
श्रद्धामयोऽयं पुरुषः यो यच्छ्रद्धः स एव सः ॥ ३ ॥

Sattvānurūpā sarvasya śraddhā bhavati Bhārata
Sraddhā-mayo(a)yam puruṣaḥ yo yacchraddhaḥ sa eva saḥ

3. The *śraddhā* of each is in accordance with his nature, O Bhārata. The man consists of (his) *śraddhā*; what his *śraddhā* is, that verily he is.

3. For explanation of Devas, Yakṣas etc. see verse 4 and footnotes thereto.

The śraddhā of each living being *is in accordance with his nature*, that is, his antaḥ-karaṇa (inner organ) with its specific tendencies (saṁskāra), *O Bhārata.* If it is so, what follows? That is being stated: *the man*, the jīva, the transmigrating soul (saṁsārin), *consists of his śraddhā.* How? *What his*, i.e. of a (particular) Jīva, the *śraddhā is, that verily he is*, that jīva is in accordance with that śraddhā.

Therefore, the condition of (one's) *śraddhā*, *sāttvic* or other, has to be inferred from its characteristic mark, namely its visible effects, such as the worship of gods or others: so the Lord says:

यजन्ते सात्त्विका देवान्यक्षरक्षांसि राजसाः ।
प्रेतान्भूतगणांश्चान्ये यजन्ते तामसा जनाः ॥ ४ ॥

Yajante sāttvikā devān-yakṣa-rakṣāṁsi rājasāḥ
Pretān-bhūta-gaṇāṁścānye yajante tāmasā janāḥ

4. *Sattvic* men worship the gods; *rajasic* men the Yakṣas and the Rākṣasas—the others—the *tamasic* men—the Pretas and the hosts of Bhūtas.

Sāttvic men, those whose condition is in Sattva, *worship*, adore, *the gods;*[4] *rājasic, man, the Yakṣas*[5] *and the Rākṣasas*[6]; *the others—the tamasic men—the Pretas*[7] *and the hosts of Bhūtas* (the elementals) as also the Seven Mothers (mātṛāks) (—a group of terrific inferior powers)[8].

Thus, by a general rule laid down in Scripture, *sāttvic* and other states (accomplishments) are determined through their respective effects. Now, only one in a thousand happens to be intent on the

4. Gods are the Vasus, etc. (Ā) They are the celestial beings, generally good.

5. Yakṣas are Kubera and his kind. (Ā) They are like demigods.

6. Rākṣasas are Nairṛta and the rest. (Ā)

7. Pretas are those Brāhmaṇas and others who, fallen off from their prescribed duties, have attained after death aerial bodies (*vāyu-deha*). .Ā)

8. It is to be understood that all these beings, when propitiated, grant the desires of the worshipper, *sāttvic, rajasic,* or *tāmasic,* as the case may be. (Ā)

worship of the gods and the like and fixed in *Sattva*, while the vast majority of creatures happen to be fixed in *Rajas* and in *Tamas*. How (is it so)?

९अशास्त्रविहितं घोरं तप्यन्ते ये तपो जनाः ।
दम्भाहंकारसंयुक्ताः कामरागबलान्विताः ॥ ५ ॥

Aśāstra-vihitam ghoram tapyante ye tapo janāḥ
Dambhāhaṁkāra-samyuktāḥ kāma-rāga-balānvitāḥ

5. Those men who practise severe austerity not enjoined by the *Śāstras*, given to ostentation and egotism, possessed with the power of desire and attachment;

(The sentence is completed in the next verse.)

Those men who practise severe austerity, which causes pain to other living beings and to themselves, *not enjoined by the Śāstras, given to ostentation and egotism, possessed with the power of desire and attachment*[10]; or (to give another meaning—) possessed of desire, attachment and power;

कर्शयन्तः शरीरस्थं भूतग्राममचेतसः ।
मां चैवान्तः शरीरस्थं तान्विद्ध्यासुरनिश्चयान् ॥ ६ ॥

Karśayantaḥ śarīrastham bhūta-grāmam-acetasaḥ
Mām caivāntaḥ-śarīrastham tān-viddhyāsura-niścayān

6. weakening all the elements in the body, and Me as well, who dwells in the body within,—know them, sense-less as they are to be of *āsuric* resolve.

Weakening all the elements, rendering feeble the group of organs, *in the body, and* weakening *Me,* Nārāyaṇa, *as well, who*

9. Verse 5 describes chiefly those fixed in *Rajas*, while verse 6 speaks chiefly of those fixed in *Tamas*. (Ā)

10. desire (*kāma*), attachment (rāga): for explanation, see VII, 11 Com.

dwells in the body within, as the Witness of their actions and thoughts:—by merely not carrying out My instructions, they 'weaken' Me; *know them to be of asuric resolve*, know that they are *senseless as they are*, wanting in proper discrimination, demoniac in their resolves, so that you may avoid them; this is as advice (to Arjuna).

In what follows, it is shown that foods, which are divided into three kinds,—namely that which is savoury and oleaginous, and so on,—are liked respectively by *sāttvic*, *rājasic*, and *tāmasic* men. This is for enabling one to know whether he is *sāttvic*, *rājasic*, or *tāmasic*, as indicated by his preponderent taste for one or other of these different classes of food, such as those which are savoury and oleaginous, and give up those foods indicative of *Rajas* and *Tamas* and take those indicative of *Sattva*. In the same way the exposition herein of the threefold division of *Yajñās* etc. according to *Sattva* and other *gunas* is also to show how one may know and leave off the *rājasic* and *tāmasic* ones and practise only those that are *sāttvic*. The Lord says:

आहारस्त्वपि सर्वस्य त्रिविधो भवति प्रियः ।
यज्ञस्तपस्तथा दानं तेषां भेदमिमं शृणु ॥ ७ ॥

Āhārastvapi sarvasya tri vidho bhavati priyaḥ
Yajñas-tāpas-tathā dānam teṣām bhedam-imam sṛṇu

7. The food also which is liked by each of them is of three kinds; as also *Yajña*, austerity, and gift. Do you hear this, their distinction.

The food also which is liked by each of them, every living being that eats, *is of three kinds*; *as also* is *Yajña*, as also is *austerity*, *and* as also is *gift*. *Do you hear this*, *their*, i.e. of food etc., *distinction*, which is about to be told.

आयुः सत्त्व बलारोग्यसुखप्रीतिविवर्धनाः ।
रस्याःस्निग्धाः स्थिरा हृद्या आहाराः सात्त्विकप्रियाः ॥ ८ ॥

Āayuḥ-sattva-balārogya-sukha-prīti-vivardhanāḥ
Rasyāḥ snigdyāḥ sthirā hṛdyā āharāḥ sāttvika-priyāḥ

8. The foods which augment life, energy, strength, health, joy, and cheerfulness, which are savoury and oleaginous, substantial, and agreealbe, are liked by the *sāttvic*.

The foods which augment life, energy, strength, health, joy, add cheerfulness[11], *which are savoury and oleaginous,* full of juice and (oily, i.e.) fatty, *substantial,* capable of lasting in the body for a long time[12], *and agreeable,* pleasing to the mind, *are liked by,* favourite to, *the sāttvic* men.

कट्वम्ल लवणात्युष्ण तीक्ष्णरूक्षविदाहिनः ।
आहारा राजसस्येष्टा दुःखशोकामयप्रदाः ॥ ९ ॥

Katvamla-lavaṇātyuṣṇa-tīkṣṇa rūkṣa-vidāhinaḥ
Āharāḥ rājasasyeṣṭā duḥkha-śokāmaya-pradāḥ

9. The foods that are bitter, sour, saline, excessively hot, pungent, dry, and burning , are liked by the *rājasic*, giving pain, grief, and disease.

The foods that are bitter, sour, saline, excessively hot, pungent, dry, and burning,—the word 'excessively' is to be construed with each of the seven, thus: 'excessively bitter', 'excessively pungent' and so on,—*are liked by the rājasic, giving,* being (i.e. and are) productive of, *pain, grief, and disease*[13].

यातयामं गतरसं पूति पर्युषितं च यत् ।
उच्छिष्टमपि चामेध्यं भोजनं तामसप्रियम् ॥ १० ॥

11. Life (*āyus*) denotes vitality; energy (*sattva*) means stability of mind, or vigour; strength (*bala*) is the capacity to accomplish what has to be done; health (*ārogya*) is freedom from disease; joy (*sukha*) is delight felt within oneself; cheerfulness (*prīti*) is happiness felt on seeing others who are successful. (Ā

12. that is, producing benefit to the body for a very long time. (Ā)

13. pain (*duḥkha*) is agony felt at the current moment; grief (*śoka*) is what is caused by the separation from a beloved object. (Ā)

Yāta-yāmam gata-rasam pūti paryuṣitam ca yat
Ucchiṣṭam-api cāmedhyam bhojanam tāmasa-priyam

10. That which is stale, and become tasteless, which is putrid, and not fresh, which is refuse, as also impure, is the food liked by the *tāmasic*.

That which is stale, i.e. half-cooked, ('yāta-yāma', which literally means 'cooked three hours ago', is thus explained, because food which has no efficacy is being described (next) by the term 'gatarasa')—*and become tasteless,* deprived of flavour, *which is putrid,* stinking, *and not fresh,* (food) over which, after it had been cooked, a night has intervened, *which is refuse,* left on the plate after a meal, *as also impure,* unfit for offering in sacrifice .yajña),—*food* of this kind *is* what is *liked by the tāmasic.*

*

Now, worship of three sorts is described:

अफलाकाङ्क्षिभिर्यज्ञो विधिदृष्टो य इज्यते ।
यष्टव्यमेवेति मनः समाधाय स सात्त्विकः ॥ ११ ॥

Aphalā-kāṅkṣibhir-yajño vidhi-dṛṣṭo ya ijyate
Yaṣṭavyam-eveti manaḥ samādhāya sa sāttvikaḥ

11. That *Yajña* is *sāttvic* which is performed by men desiring no fruit, as enjoined by ordinance, having settled their mind solely in the thought that the *Yajña* should be offered.

That Yajna is said to be *sattvic which is performed by men desiring*, seeking to obtain, *no fruit*,

as enjoined by ordinance, as fixed by scriptural injunction,

having settled their mind solely in the thought that the Yajña should be offered, having resolved that their duty is simply

the performance of the Yajña itself, in its true form, and that no personal end has to be secured by it.

अभिसंधाय तु फलं दम्भार्थमपि चैव यत् ।
इज्यते भरतश्रेष्ठ तं यज्ञं विद्धि राजसम् ॥ १२ ॥

Abhisandhāya tu phalam dambhārtham-api caiva yat
Ijyate bharata-sreṣṭha tam yajñam viddhi rājasam

12. That which is performed, O best of Bhāratas, seeking for fruit, and for ostentation, know it to be rājasic Yajña.

That which is performed, O best of Bhāratas, seeking for, motivated by, *fruit, and for ostentation*[14], *know it to be rājasic Yajna*:

विधिहीनमसृष्टान्नं मन्त्रहीनमदक्षिणम् ।
श्रद्धाविरहितं यज्ञं तामसं परिचक्षते ॥ १३ ॥

Vidhi-hīnam-asṛṣṭānnam mantra-hīnam-adakṣiṇam
Śraddhā-virahitam yajñam tāmasam paricakṣate

13. They declare that *Yajña* to be *tāmasic*, which is performed without heed to ordinance, in which no food is distributed, which is devoid of *mantras* and gifts, and which is devoid of faith.

They declare that Yajña to be tāmasic, as the effect of Tamas, *which is performed without heed to ordinance*, which is contrary to scriptural injunction, *in which no food is distributed* to Brāhmaṇas, *which is devoid of mantras*, (i.e., *Yajña* performed) with hymns deprived of accents and letters, *and* without *gifts* of the prescribed presents (to priests), *and which is devoid of faith.*

14. for fruit, such as *svarga* (heaven); and for ostentation, with a view to publicising one's religiousness and piety. (Ā)

*

Now, austerity of three kinds will be stated:

देवद्विजगुरुप्राज्ञपूजनं शौचमार्जवम् ।
ब्रह्मचर्यमहिंसा च शारीरं तप उच्यते ॥ १४ ॥

Deca-dvija-guru-prājña-pūjanam-śaucam-ārjavam
Brahmacaryam-ahimsā ca śārīram tapa ucyate

14. Worship of the Devas, the twice-born, the Gurus, and the wise, and purity, rectitude, continence, and non-injuriousness are called austerity of the body.

Worship of the[15] *Devas*, of *the twice-born*, of *the Gurus, and* of *the wise*, and *purity*, *rectitude*, straight-forwardness, *continence*, and *non-injuriousness, are called austerity of the body*, i.e. which is accomplished by the body,—in fact by all the factors of action such as the doer etc., among which the body is the chief, regarding which the Lord says later on, "These five are its causes" (XVIII.15).

अनुद्वेगकरं वाक्यं सत्यं प्रियहितं च यत् ।
स्वाध्यायाभ्यसनं चैव वाङ्मयं तप उच्यते ॥ १५ ॥

Anudvega-karma vākyam satyam priya-hitam ca yat
Svādhyāyābhyasanam caiva vāṅgmayam tapa ucyate

15. Speech which causes no excitement, and is true, as also agreeable and beneficial, and also the practice of sacred recitation, are said to form the austerity of speech.

Speech which causes no excitement, no pain or unhappiness (duḥkha) to living beings, *and is true, as also agreeable and beneficial*, concerning respectively the seen and the un-seen (worlds).—

15. The Devas are Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva, and others; the Gurus are the father and others (venerable persons); the wise are those who have known that which ought to be known. (Ā)

'Speech' is qualified by the attributes, 'causing no excitement, etc. The word 'ca' ("as also") signifies that all the attributes are to be taken together collectively. If speech employed in addressing another be wanting in all, any one, two, or three, of the attributes of 'being true', 'being agreeable', 'being beneficial', and 'causing no excitement', then that cannot constitute the austerity of speech. Thus, if speech which is true be lacking in any one, two, or, three of the other attributes, that (speech) cannot constitute the austerity of speech. So also, an agreeable speech lacking in any one, two, or three, of the other attributes cannot constitute the austerity of speech. In the same way, beneficial speech also, lacking in any one, two, or three, of the other attributes cannot constitute the austerity of speech. What then is that austerity (of speech)? The speech which is true, which causes no excitement, which is also agreeable ānd beneficial, —that constitutes the supreme austerity with respect to speech. As for example: "Be tranquil, my son, practise the study of the Veda and Yoga; thus will blessedness (śreyas) come to you".

and also the practice of sacred recitation, in the manner prescribed[16],—all these *are said to form the austerity of speech*[17].

मनःप्रसादः सौम्यत्वं मौनमात्मविनिग्रहः ।
भावसंशुद्धिरित्येतत्तपो मानसमुच्यते ॥ १६ ॥

Manaḥ prasādaḥ saumyatvam maudam-ātma-vinigrahaḥ
Bhāva-samśuddhir-ityetat-tapo mānasam-ucyate

16. Serenity of mind, kindliness, silence, self-control, purity of heart,—this is called the mental austerity.

Serenity of mind, tranquillity of mind. attainment of (mental) clarity; *kindliness*, that which is known as good-heartedness, the state of the internal organ (antaḥ-karaṇa) which shows itself in

16. such as facing the east and waring a ring of *kuśa* grass (*pavitrām*). (Ā)

17. Since speech is abundantly concerned in this austerity, it is *vāṅgmaya*, i.e. austerity chiefly of speech. (Ā)

the brightness of the face, etc.; *silence*: control of thought is silence; even silence in speech is preceded by control of thought (mind); and so, by the effect (silence in speech) the cause (control of mind) is referred to. *Self-control*, all-round and general control of the mind: this is to be distinguished from silence (mauna) which is the control of the mind with respect to speech only. *Purity of hear* is honesty of motive, absence of hypocrisy, when dealing with others. All *this is called mental austerity.*

How the afore-taught austerity of body, of speech, and of mind, as practised by men, falls into three classes according to the different natures, *Sattva* and the rest, will now be stated:

श्रद्धया परया तप्तं तपस्तत्त्रिविधं नरैः ।
अफलाकाङ्क्षिभिर्युक्तैः सात्त्विकं परिचक्षते ॥ १७ ॥

Śraddhayā parayā taptam tapas-tat-trividham naraiḥ
Aphalākāṁkṣibhir-yuktaiḥ sāttvikam paricakṣate

17. This, the three-fold austerity, practised by steadfast men, with great *Sraddha*, desiring no fruit, they call *sāttvic*.

This, the subject-matter under consideration, *the three-fold austerity*, respectively concerned with the three seats[18], *practised by steadfast*[19] *men*, i.e. practicants, *with great śraddhā*, with supreme (āstikya-buddhi, i.e., faith in the existence of God and another world, taught by scripture, *desiring no fruit*,

this sort of tapas, *they*, the sages, *call sāttvic*, the result of Sattva.

सत्कारमानपूजार्थं तपो दम्भेन चैव यत् ।
क्रियते तदिह प्रोक्तं राजसं चलमध्रुवम् ॥ १८ ॥

18. namely, the body, speech, and mind. (Ā)

19. i.e. unaffected in success and failure. (Ā)

Satkāra-māna-pūjārtham tapo dambhena caiva yat
Kriyate tad-iha proktam rājasam calam-adhruvam

18. That austerity which is practised with the object of gaining welcome, honour, and worship, and with ostentation, is here said to be *rājasic*, unstable and transitory.

That austerity which is practised with the object of gaining welcome, in such terms as, "here is a virtuous man, a Brāhmana of great austerities", *honour*, shown by the act of rising to greet and making reverential salutation, etc., *and worship*, which is performed by washing the feet, adoring, and feeding, etc., *and with ostentation*[20], *is here*[21] *said to be rājasic*, unstable and transitory, as productive of occasional results (only).

मूढग्राहेणात्मनो यत्पीडया क्रियते तपः ।
परस्योत्सादनार्थं वा तत्तामसमुदाहृतम् ॥ १९ ॥

Mūḍha-grāheṇātmano yat-pīḍayā kriyate tapaḥ
Parasyotsādanārtham vā tat-tāmasam-udāhṛtam

19. That austerity which is practised out of a foolishly persistent notion, with self-torture, or for the purpose of ruining another, is declared to be tāmasic.

That austerity which is practised out of a foolishly persistent, notion, a fixed opinion wanting in correct judgment, *with self-torture, or for the purpose of ruining*, destroying, *another is declared to be tāmasic austerity*.

Now, the varieties in the case of gift are described:

दातव्यमिति यद्दानं दीयतेऽनुपकारिणे ।
देशे काले च पात्रे च तद्दानं सात्त्विकं स्मृतम् ॥ २० ॥

20. with no sincere belief, but for mere show, hypocritically. (Ā)

21. 'here' is explained also in the sense of 'in this world' i.e. yielding fruti only in this world. (Ā)

Dātavyam-iti yad-dānam dīyate(a)nupakāriṇe
Deśe kāle ca pātre ca tad-dānam sāttvikam smṛtam

20. Gift given with the conviction that "giving is a duty", to one who does no service in return, in a fit place, and at (the proper) time, and to a worthy person, that gift is held to be *sāttvic*.

What *gift is* given with the conviction that "giving is a duty' *to one who does no service in return,* to the one who is incapable of doing a service in return, or to one from whom, though able to do some good in return, no such return is expected, *in a fit* holy *place,* such as Kurukṣetra, *and at* the proper *time,* such as the Saṁkrānti (the transit of the Sun from one zodiacal sign to another), *and to a worthy person,* such as one profficient in the Veda and learned in its six members[22], *that gift is held to be sāttvic.*

यत्तु प्रत्युपकारार्थं फलमुद्दिश्य वा पुनः ।
दीयते च परिक्लिष्टं तद्दानं राजसं स्मृतम् ॥ २१ ॥

Yattu pratyupakārārtham phalam-uddiśya vā punaḥ
Dīyate ca parikliṣṭam tad-dānam rājasam smṛtam

21. And what is given with a view to receiving a return, or looking for the fruit, or again reluctantly, that gift is held to be *rājasic*.

And what gift is *given with a view to receiving a return,* with, the hope that the recipient will in time do some good in return *or looking for the fruit,* namely, that the unseen reward (adṛṣṭa) for this gift will be enjoyed by me (i.e. donor) in the next world, *or again reluctantly,* accompanied by mental distress, *that gift is held to be rājasic.*

22. These are *Śiksa, Kalpa, Vyākarana, Nirukta, Chandas* and *Jyotiṣa,* regarded as auxiliary to the Vedas, and designed to aid in the correct pronounciation and interpretation of the text and the right employment of the *mantras* in ceremonials.

अदेशकाले यद्दानमपात्रेभ्यश्च दीयते ।
असत्कृतमवज्ञातं तत्तामसमुदाहृतम् ॥ २२ ॥

Adeśa-kāle yad-dānam-apātrebhyaśca dīyate
Asat-kṛtam-avajñātam tat-tāmasam-udahṛtam

22. The gift that is given at a wrong place, or time, to unworthy persons, without regard or with disdain, that is declared to be *tāmasic*.

The gift that is given at a wrong place, a place which is not sacred and which is associated with "mlecchas"[23], with unholy things, and the like, *or* (*wrong*) *time*, which is not celebrated as auspicious, which is not considered as special (such as the Saṁkrānti, and *to unworthy persons*, such as fools or thieves, and—even if made at the proper place etc.—*without regard*, without kind words, without the washing of the feet, without adoration etc. *or with disdain*, accompanied with humiliation of the recipient, *that gift is declared to be tāmasic*.

The following instructions are laid down with a view to teaching how *Yajña*, gift, austerity, etc. can be made perfect.[24]

ॐ तत्सदिति निर्देशो ब्रह्मणस्त्रिविधः स्मृतः ।
ब्राह्मणास्तेन वेदाश्च यज्ञाश्च विहिताः पुरा ॥ २३ ॥

Om tat-sad-iti nirdeśo Brahmaṇas-trividhaḥ smṛtaḥ
Brāhmaṇāstena Vedāśca yajñāśca vihitāḥ purā

23. Non-vedics, those not conforming to Vedic institutions.

24. When a prescribed action, *Yajña*, etc., becomes defective due to carelessness, the defect is rectified and the action rendered perfect by uttering one of the three specified designations of Brahman (as per v. 23) at the time the defect is apprehended;, of which three),

"*Om*" is the principal name of Brahman, according to the *Śruti*, "Om is Brahman" (*Tai.* viii. 1);

"*Tat*" is also a name of Brahman, according to the *Śruti*, "*Tat-tvam-asi*" (Ch. VI. viii. 7);

"*Sat*" is also a name of Brahman, as stated in the *Śruti*, "All this, my dear, is *Sat* alone" (Ch.VI.ii.1). (Ā)

23. "Om, Tat, Sat"—this has been declared the triple designation of Brahman. By that were made of old the Brāhmaṇas (Brahmiṇs) and the Vedas and the *Yajñas*.

"*Om, Tat, Sat*"—in *this* manner *has been declared,* in the Vedantas, by the knowers of Brahman after mature contemplation, *the triple designation,* by name, *of Brahman. By that* threefold designation, *were made,* created, *of old*[25], *the Brāhmaṇas,* and *the Vedas, and the Yajnas.* This is stated in praise of the (triple) designation.

तस्मादोमित्युदाहृत्य यज्ञदानतपः क्रियाः ।
प्रवर्तन्ते विधानोक्ताः सततं ब्रह्मवादिनाम् ॥ २४ ॥

Tasmād-om-ityudāhṛtya yajña-dāna-tapaḥ-kriyāḥ
Pravartante vidhānoktāḥ satatam Brahmavādinām

24. Therefore, uttering "Om", acts of *Yajñas*, gift, and austerity, of the followers of Brahman, always proceed, as enjoined in the ordinances.

Therefore, uttering, pronouncing, "*Om*", *acts of Yajña, gift, and austerity,* i.e. acts in the form of Yajña, etc., *of the followers of Brahman,* those engaged in the utterance of Brahman[26], *always,* at all times, *proceed, as enjoined in the ordinances,* as directed in the Scriptures (Śāstra).

तदित्यनभिसंधाय फलं यज्ञतपः क्रियाः ।
दानक्रियाश्च विविधाः क्रियन्ते मोक्षकाङ्क्षिभिः ॥ २५ ॥

Tad-ityanabhisandhāya phalam yajña-tapaḥ-kriyāḥ
Dānā-kriyāśca vividhāḥ kriyante mokṣa-kāṁksibhiḥ

25. at the beginning of creation, by Prajāpati. (Ā)

26. "Brahman", here, means the Veda. (Ā)

25. With "*Tat*", without aiming at fruits, are the various acts of *Yajña*, austerity, and gift, performed by the seekers of *Mokṣa*.

With "Tat", uttering 'Tat', which is a designation of Brahman *without aiming at* the *fruits* of the acts of Yajña etc., *are the various acts of Yajña, of austerity, and* of *gift*, such as of land, gold, etc.. *performed by the seekers of Mokṣa*, those who desire final liberation.

The uses of the words "Om" and "Tat" have been explained. Now, the use of the word "Sat" is being told:

सद्भावे साधुभावे च सदित्येतत्प्रयुज्यते ।
प्रशस्ते कर्मणि तथा सच्छब्दः पार्थ युज्यते ॥ २६ ॥

Sad-bhāve sādhu-bhāve ca sad-ityetat-prayujyate
Praśaste karmaṇi tathā sacchabdaḥ Pārtha yujyate

26. The word "*Sat*" is used in the sense of 'reality' and of 'goodness'; and so also, O Pārtha, the word "*Sat*" is used in the sense of an 'auspicious act'.

The word "Sat" is used, this designation of Brahman is mentioned, *in the sense of 'reality'*, in expressing as a reality an object which is non-existent, such as the birth of a son who is not existent, *and* in the sense of '*goodness*', in expressing as virtuous the evil conduct of a person who is not virtuous; *and so also, O Pārtha, the word (Sat" is used*, employed, *in the sense of an 'auspicious act'*, such as a marriage.

यज्ञे तपसि दाने च स्थितिः सदिति चोच्यते ।
कर्म चैव तदर्थीयं सदित्येवाभिधीयते ॥ २७ ॥

Yajñe tapasi dāne ca sthitiḥ sad-iti cocyate
Karma caiva tad-arthīyam sad-ityevābhidhīyate

27. Steadiness in *Yajña*, austerity, and gift, is also

called "*Sat*"; as also action in connection with these is called "*Sat*".

Steadiness in Yajña, the act of sacrifice, steadiness in *austerity and steadiness* in *gift*, *is also called "Sat"* by the learned; *as also action in connection with these*, Yajña, gift, and austerity.

Or, (another meaning is:) action for the sake of the Lord[27]. whose triple designation is the subject on hand,—*is called "Sat"*

These acts of *Yajña*, austerity, etc., even if they be not *sāttvic* and wanting in perfection, become possessed of all good qualities and *sāttvic* nature, on employing (with reference to them) the three designations of Brahman, with *śraddha*.

Since, in all these[28], every perfection is gained through the predominance of *śraddhā*, therefore,—

अश्रद्धया हुतं दत्तं तपस्तप्तं कृतं च यत् ।
असदित्युच्यते पार्थ न च तत्प्रेत्य नो इह ॥ २८ ॥

Aśraddhayā hutam dattam tapas-taptam kṛtam ca yat
Asad-ityucyate Pārtha na ca tat-pretya no iha

28. Whatever is sacrificed, given, or performed, and whatever austerity is practised, without *śraddhā*, it is called "*asat*", O Partha; it is naught here or hereafter.

Whatever is sacrificed, offered as oblation into fire, *without śraddhā*, *given* to Brāhmaṇās, without śraddhā, *and whatever austerity is practised*, without śraddhā, and whatever is *performed*, in like manner, without śraddhā, such as acts of praise and obeisance, *it*, all that, *is called "asat"*, since they are outside the

27. "*Tad-arthīyam*" lends itself to two interpretations: One, "tad": the three-some of *yajña*, gift and austerity; "arthīyam"; : in connection with. Two, "*Tad*": the Lord, Īśvara; "arthīyam ": for the sake of (i.e., dedication to).

28. i.e., *yajña* and the rest. (Ā)

path which is the means to reach Me, *O Pārtha*. Though entailing much trouble, *it is naught yere or hereafter*: as it is condemned by the wise, it is neither of any use here, nor can it produce any effect conducive to good in the hereafter[29].

इति श्री महाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्यां
भीष्मपर्वणि श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु
ब्रह्मविद्यायां योगशास्त्रे श्रीकृष्णार्जुन-
संवादे श्रद्धात्रयविभागयोगो
नाम सप्तदशोऽध्यायः ॥

Iti Śrī Mahābhārate śatasāhasryām samhitāyām Vaiyāsikyām Bhīṣma-Parvaṇi Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītāsūpaniṣatsu Brahma-vidyāyām yogaśāstre Śrī Kṛṣṇārjuna-Samvāde Śraddhātraya-vibhāga-yogo nāma SAPTADAŚO-(A) DHYAYAḤ

Thus the seventeenth chapter entitled 'The Mode of Division of the Three Kinds of Faith' in the Upaniṣads known as 'The Celebrated Songs of the Lord'—expounding the knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna embodied in the Bhīṣma Parva of Śrī Mahābhārata, the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyāsa.

29. The teaching of this chapter is thus summed up by Ānandagiri: even though ignorant of the teaching of Scripture, men endued with *śraddhā*,—who fall into the three classes, *sāttvic*, etc., according to the nature of their *śraddhā*,—can abide in *Sattva* by avoiding the *rājasic* and the *tāmasic* kinds of food, etc. (i.e. *Yājña*, gift, and austerity), and resorting only to the *sāttvic* kind of food, etc. And, even if their acts of *Yajña* etc. become destitute of merit, they can remove the defect by pronouncing the (three) designations of Brahman. Their *buddhi* thus purified, they qualify for the discipline of *śravaṇo* (hearing) etc., by which they will attain the direct realisation of Truth and become liberated.

अष्टादशोऽध्यायः ॥
(मोक्षसंन्यास योगः)

AṢṬĀDAŚO(A)DHYĀYAḤ
(MOKṢA–SAṀNYĀSA YOGAḤ)

CHAPTER – XVIII

(THE YOGA OF LIBERATION IN RENUNCIATION)

This chapter proceeds to set out, by way of summing up, the import of the entire, *Gītā-śastra*, as also the import of the Vedas, in its entirety. Indeed, the Teaching contained in all the preceding chapters is comprehended in this Chapter. Arjuna, however, desiring to know merely the distinction in meaning between the words '*saṁnysā*' (renunciation) and '*tyāga*' (sacrifice), puts the question:

अर्जुन उवाच —

संन्यासस्य महाबाहो तत्त्वमिच्छामि वेदितुम् ।
त्यागस्य च हृषीकेश पृथक्केशिनिषूदन ॥ १ ॥

Arjuna uvāca—

Saṁnyāsasya mahābāho tattva-micchāmi veditum
Tyāgasya ca Hṛṣīkeśa pṛthak-Keśi-niṣūdana

Arjuna said—

1. I desire to know severally, O mighty-armed, the truth of *saṁnyāsa*, as also of *tyāga*, O Hṛṣīkeśa, O slayer of Keśin!

I desire to know, understand, severally, as differentiated from each other, *O mighty-armed*, *the truth*, the essential nature, *of*

saṁnyāsa, of that which is connoted by the term 'saṁnyāsa', *as also of tyāga*, of that which is connoted by the term 'tyāga',

O Hṛṣikeśa, O slayer of Keśin! Keśin was an asura in the disguise of a horse. He was slain by the Lord, Vāsudeva[1]; and the Lord is accordingly addressed by Arjuna by the appellation, 'slayer of Keśin.'

The words '*samnyāsa*' and '*tyāga*' have been mentioned here and there in the preceding chapters; but their connotations have not been ascertained[2]. Therefore, with a view to conclusively defining them, the Lord addresses Arjuna, who enquired (about the matter).

श्री भगवानुवाच —
काम्यानां कर्मणां न्यासं संन्यासं कवयो विदुः ।
सर्वकर्मफलत्यागं प्राहुस्त्यागं विचक्षणाः ॥ २ ॥

Śrī Bhagavān-uvāca

Kāmyānām karmaṇām nyāsam saṁnyāsam kavayo viduḥ
Sarva-karma-phala-tyāgam prāhus-tyāgam vicakṣaṇāḥ

The Blessed Lord said—

2. The renunciation of *kāmya* action, sages understand as *saṁnyāsa*; the wise declare the abandonment of the fruits of all works as *tyāga*.

Some *sages*, wise men, *understand the renunciation*, abandonment, *of kāmya actions*, actions accompanied with a desire for fruits, such as the Aśvamedha (Horse-sacrifice)—

That is to say, (the sages understand) the non-performance of (kāmya) actions which are presented (in the Śāstra) as worthy

1. Vide *V.P.* V. 26.

2. Clearly distinguishing their signification. (Ā)

of performance,—as *saṁnyāsa*, as what is signified by the term 'saṁnyāsa'.

The wise, the learned, *declāre the abandonment of the fruits of all works*, i.e. of the fruits of all actions, 'nitya' and 'naimittika', which are performed and the fruits of which accrue to the performer, *as* what is signified by the term '*tyāga*'.

Whether the abandonment of (*kāmya*) works which are intended for securing desirable fruits, or the abandonment of the fruits (of works) be the meaning declared (by the two words respectively), the same thing, namely 'abandonment', is by all means their signification[3]. They do not signify matters belonging to different species, such as the words 'pot' and 'cloth' do.

Objection:—Is it not said that the obligatory (*nitya*) and the occasional (*naimittika*) works produce no fruits? How then is it that the abandonment of their fruits is (here) spoken of? It is like speaking of the abandonment of a barron woman's son.

Reply:—There is no room for such objection here, since the Lord favours the view that even the obligatory (*nitya*) works produce their own effects (v.9 infra). Verily does He say (in what follows) that "the three-fold fruit of action—disagreeable, etc.,—accrues to the non-relinquishers after death, but never to the *saṁnyāsins*" (v. 12). Therein, He teaches that only for *saṁnyāsins* is there absolute non-connection with the fruit of action; and that those who are not *saṁnyāsins* have to meet after their death with the fruit of the obligatory duties they are bound to perform.

त्याज्यं दोषवदित्येके कर्म प्राहुर्मनीषिणः ।
यज्ञदानतपःकर्म न त्याज्यमिति चापरे ॥ ३ ॥

Tyājyam doṣavad-ityeke karma prāhur-manīṣṭṇaḥ
Yajña-danā-tapaḥ-karma na tyājyam-iti cāpare

3. It will be contrary to the accepted usage to give absolutely different meanings to the two words (*sāṁnyāga* and *tyāga*). It is accordingly explained that though there is a distinction between the two, they are not absolutely different in their sense. (Ā)

3. Some philosophers declare that action should be relinquished as an evil; and others (say) that acts of *yajña*, gift, and austerity, should not be given up.

Some philosophers, learned men following the view of the *Sāṁkhyas*, etc., *declare that action*, all action, as being productive of bondage, *should be relinquished*, given up, *as an evil*, because evil is inherent therein. Or (—to give another interpretation—), just as evils, i.e., attachment etc., are given up, so also all action should be given up, even by karmins who are competent and have the duty to perform action.

And, on this same subject[4], *others* say *that acts of yajña*, gift, *and austerity, should not be given up*.

It is with regard to the *Karmins* alone, who are competent and have the duty to perform action, that these alternative views are held, but not with respect to *saṁnyāsins*, those devoted to Knowledge and who have risen up (above worldly concerns). Those (saṁnyāsins or sāṁkhyas) who have been raised above the duty of performing karma in the words. "Devotion by the path of Jñāna-Yoga has been taught by Me for the Sāṁkhyas, in the beginning" (III.3), are out of consideration here.

Objection:—Can it not be that even as those persons competent for and having the duty to perform works,—though their devotion to a separate (different) path has been previously specified in the words, "By Karma-Yoga for the Yogins" (III.3)—are the subject of discussion here, in the (this) section where the whole teaching of the Gitā—) Śāstra is summed up, so also the Sāṁkhyas, the devotees of Wisdom, should also form the subject of discussion here?

Reply:—No; because, with regard to them, it is not possible to conceive of their renouncing (duty) as a result of delusion or on account of pain (vv. 7 & 8). The *sāṁkhyas* do not perceive in the Self any pain whatever caused by bodily trouble, since desire and

4. i.e. with reference to the same class of persons, who have the duty to perform *karma*. The view of Mīmāṁsakas is now stated. (Ā)

5. referring to the obligatory (*nitya*) and the occasional (*naimittika*) rites. (Ā)

the rest (among which pain is included) have been declared to be the attributes of the *kṣetra* alone (XIII.6). Consequently, they do not abandon action for fear of bodily trouble and pain. Nor do they see actions in the Self; and only if they could see action in the Self would it be possible for them to abandon obligatory works from delusion.—Indeed, they renounce (works) because they know that actions pertain to the *Guṇas* (III.27), and are of the conviction, "I do nothing at all" (V.8). The manner of the renunciation of the knowers of the Truth is simply as described in the verse, "The embodied, having renounced all actions by the mind," etc. (V.13).

Therefore, it is only the other class of persons, those ignorant of the true nature of the Self, who are qualified for the performance of works, and for whom there is the possibility of abandoning (works) out of delusion and the fear of bodily trouble, that are reproached as relinquishers of the *tāmasic* and the *rājasic* classes (v.v. 7 and 8), with a view to praising the abandonment of the fruits of action by the *kārmins* (those devoted to the path of Works), who are *anātmajñas*, i.e., devoid of Self-knowledge. On the other hand, the true saṁnyāsin has been distinguished as one "who has renounced all undertakings" (XII.16), "who is silent" (XII.19), "content with anything" (XII.19), "homeless, steady-minded" (XII.19), and characterised by the marks indicative of having gone beyond the Guṇas (XIV, 22 to 26). And, the Lord will hereafter describe (his state) as "that supreme consummation of Knowledge" (XVIII-50). Therefore, it is not those devoted to Wisdom, the saṁnyāsins, who are under consideration here. It is only the abandonment of the fruits of action, by virtue of its being of the *sāttvic* nature, which is spoken of as '*saṁnyāsa*' (in the secondary sense), as compared with the *tāmasic* and *rājasic* (abandonment of action); but not the *saṁnyāsa* proper, (in the primary sense) which consists in the renunciation of all works.

Objection:—It being impossible to renounce all action, on account of the reason stated (by the Lord), namely, "Action cannot indeed be entirely relinquished by an embodied being" (XVIII-11), what is under discussion is itself *saṁnyāsa* in the primary sense.

Reply:—Not so; because the statement of that reason is for

the purposed of eulogising (the abandonment of the fruit of action). Just as the statement, "on renouncing, peace immediately follows,' (XII.12), is only a praise of the abandonment of the fruits of action,—since it is a precept to Arjuna, who could not practise the several alternatives previously referred to, and who was not possessed of Self-knowledge—, so also is this statement, "Action cannot indeed be entirely relinquished by an embodied being" (XVIII-11), made for the purpose of eulogising the abndonment of the fruit of action. And, it is impossible for anybody to contradict the position, "Having renounced all action by the mind, he rests——without at all acting or causing to act". .V. 13) (which applies to the samnyasin proper, and which clearly shows that action can be entirely relinquished by the adepts.).

Therefore, it is concluded that these alternative views concerning *samnyāsa* and *tyāga* have reference only to those whose duty lies in the performance of action. But, for the *sāṁkhyas*, those who perceive the Supreme Truth, their duty lies only in devotion to the path of Knowledge, characterised by the renunciation of all actions, and in nothing else; and, consequently, they cannot fittingly be the subject of the alternative views (set out here). And, exactly this have we established when commenting on the verse. "He who knows This to be Indestructible" (II.21), and at the commencement of the third chapter.

Now, as regards these alternative views—

निश्चयं शृणु मे तत्र त्यागे भरतसत्तम ।
त्यागो हि पुरुषव्याघ्र त्रिविधः संप्रकीर्तितः ॥ ४ ॥

Nśicayam sṛṇu me tatra tyāge Bharata-sattama
Tyāgo hi puruṣa-vyāghra trividhaḥ saṁprakīrtitaḥ

4. Hear from Me the final truth about this relinquishment, O best of the Bhāratas! For, relinquishment has been declared to be of three kinds, O tiger among men!

Hear, understand *from Me*, from My words, *the final Truth about this relinquishment*, concerning the alternatives of 'abandon-

ment' and 'renunciation' which have been stated above, *O best of the Bhāratas. For, relinquishment* (tyāga)—the Lord has used the word 'tyāga' here, implying that the sense expressed by the uords 'tyāga' and 'samnyāsa' is one and the same—*has been declared*, distinctly stated in the śāstras, *to be of three kinds*, tamasic, etc., *O tiger among men*!

Wherefore it is difficult to know the fact that the three-fold relinquishment, tāmasic etc., expressed by the words '*tyāga*' and '*saṁnyāsa*' is possible in the case of the *karmin*, who is competent for and has the duty to perform actions and who does not have Self-knowledge, but not in the case of him who perceives the Supreme Truth, therefore, nobody other than Myself, is competent to speak about the truth concerning the subject. So, hear from Me, the Lord's (Īśvara's, i.e. My) determined view about the true teaching of the *śāstras*.

What then is this final truth? The Lord says;

यज्ञदानतपः कर्म न त्याज्यं कार्यमेव तत् ।
यज्ञो दानं तपश्चैव पावनानि मनीषिणाम् ॥ ५ ॥

Yajña-dāna-tapah-karma na tyājyam kāryam-eva tat
Yajño dānam tapaścaiva pāvanāni manīṣiṇām

5. The work (act; action) of *yajña*, gift, and austerity, should not be relinquished, but it should indeed be performed; (because) *yajña*, gift, and also austerity, are purifying to the intelligent.

The work, which is of the three forms, *of yajña, gift, and austerity, should not be relinquished, but it should indeed be performed.* Why? Because *yajña, gift, and also āusterity are purifying*, productive of complete purity, *to the intelligent*, i.e. in those who have no desire for the fruits.

एतान्यपि तु कर्माणि सङ्गं त्यक्त्वा फलानि च ।
कर्तव्यानीति मे पार्थ निश्चितं मतमुत्तमम् ॥ ६ ॥

Etānyapi tu karmāṇi saṁgam tyaktvā phalāni ca
Kartavyānīti me Pārtha niścitam matam-uttamam

6. But even these works, O Pārtha, should be performed, leaving attachment and the fruits; this is My best and certain conviction.

But even these works, yajña, gift, and austerity, which have been declared to be purifying, *O Pārtha, should be performed* regularly engaged in, *leaving*, abandoning, *attachment* for them *and the fruits*, which they may produce; *this is My best and certain conviction.*

After having made a solemn declaration in the words, "hear from Me the final truth about this...." 'XVIII.4), and having mentioned the purifying nature (of *yajña*, etc.) as the reason (for the declared opinion), the Lord says, "even these works should be performed......, this is My best and certain conviction", by way of concluding the import of that solemn declaration. The words, "even these .works)" do not refer to something not already mentioned, since it is proper to take them as referring to the matter under discussion, immediately preceding. The implication of the word 'even' is that these actions, though they are the cause of bondage for the man who has attachment (for them) and seeks after (their) fruit, should be performed by the seeker after liberation. The words, "even these (actions)" are not employed, having in mind other actions (than *yajña*, gift, and austerity).

But others explains as follows: It is not appropriate to speak of 'leaving attachment and the fruits' of obligatory rites (*nitya-karmas*), because they produce no fruit; (therefore) by the words, "even these (actions)", it is meant that even works which are intended for some particular object (*kāmya-karmas*)—different from the obligatory ones—should be performed; how much more then *yajña*, gift, and austerity, which are obligatory!

This (explanation) is not correct; for it has been established here that even the obligatory actions are productive of fruit, in the words, "*Yajña*, gift, and austerity are purifying" etc. (XVIII.5). To the seeker of liberation who wants to abandon even the obliga-

tory actions, distrusting them as productive of bondage, where is the contingency of engaging in actions intended for attaining specially desired objects? And since *kāmya-karmas* have been despised in the words, "Work (with desire) is far inferior" (II.49), and their constituting the cause of bondage decisively declared in the verse, "Except for action performed for the sake of *yajna*", (III-9), "The Vedas deal with the three *Guṇas*" (II. 45), "The knowers of the three Vedas, drinking *soma*" (IX.20), and "They enter the mortal world on the exhaustion of their merit" (IX.21), and since they are far removed from the context[6], the words "even these (actions)" cannot signify *kāmya-karmas.*

Therefore, for a seeker of liberation, who does not possess Self-knowledge, and has (consequently) the duty to perform action,—

नियतस्य तु संन्यासः कर्मणो नोपपद्यते ।
मोहात्तस्य परित्यागस्तामसः परिकीर्तितः ॥ ७ ॥

Niyatasya tu saṁnyāsaḥ karmaṇo nopapadyate
Mohāt-tasya parityāgas-tāmasaḥ pari-kīrtitaḥ

7. Verily, the renunciation of obligatory action is not proper. Abandonment of the same through delusion is declared to be *tāmasic.*

Verily, the renunciation, abandonment, *of obligatory action,* the constant acts of duty (nitya-karma) *is not proper*; since it is esteemed as a purifier in the case of the un-enlightened person. *Abandonment of the same,* of obligatory action, *through delusion, ignorance*[7];

To hold that a duty is obligatory, that it must necessarily be performed, and then to abandon it, is self-contradictory; therefore, the abandonment is due to delusion;

6. The word 'these' ("*etani*") in verse 6, which points to what is immediately proximate, can refer only to *Yajña* and other nitya-karmas spoken of in verse 5, and cannot signify '*kāmya-karmas*' which are spoken of in verse 2, which is not immediately connected. (Ā)

7. utter lack of the knowledge that it is purifying. (Ā)

And that *is declared to be tāmasic*, inasmuch as delusion is itself Tamas.

And also,

दुःखमित्येव यत्कर्म कायक्लेशभयात्त्यजेत् ।
स कृत्वा राजसं त्यागं नैव त्यागफलं लभेत् ॥ ८ ॥

Duḥkham-ityeva yat-karma kāya-kleśa-bhayāt-tyajet
Sa kṛtvā rājasam tyāgam naiva tyāga-phalam labhet

8. He who, from fear of bodily trouble, relinquishes whatever action, only because it is painful, thus performing a *rājasic* relinquishment, he shall not, indeed, obtain the fruit of relinquishment.

He who, from fear of bodily trouble, apprehension of distress to the body, *relinquishes*, abandons, *whatever action, only because it is painful, thus performing a rājasic relinquishment*, one effected by Rajas, *he shall not indeed, obtain*, he surely does not obtain, *the fruit of relinquishment*, Mokṣa, which is the fruit of the renunciation of all actions, accompanied with Wisdom.

Then what is *sāttvic* relinquishment? (The answer follows:)

कार्यमित्येव यत्कर्म नियतं क्रियतेऽर्जुन ।
सङ्गं त्यक्त्वा फलं चैव स त्यागः सात्त्विको मतः ॥ ९ ॥

Kāryam-ityeva yat-karma niyatam kriyate(A)rjuna
Saṁgam tyaktvā phalam caiva sa tyāgaḥ sāttviko mataḥ

9. Whatever obligatory work is performed, O Arjuna, merely because it ought to be done, leaving attachment and also the fruit, such relinquishment is regarded as *sāttvic*.

Whatever obligatory work, nitya karma, *is performed*, executed, *O Arjuna, merely because it ought to be done, leaving attachment, and also the fruit*:

This declaration of the Lord, we have already said, is the authority for holding that obligatory (nitya) actions do produce fruits. Or, an ignorant man may think that though no fruit is declared in Scripture in respect of obligatory works, nevertheless the performance of obligatory rites can produce fruits for himself in the form of self-purification or repelling the sin of non-performance; and the Lord forbids such an imaginary thought also by the words, "leaving the fruit". Thus the words, "leaving attachment and also the fruit" have been fittingly uttered.

such relinquishment, namely, the abandonment of attachment and the fruit, with respect to obligatory works, *is regarded*, approved, *as sattvic*, as effected by Sattva (-Guna).

Objection:—The topic under discussion is that abandonment of actions, *saṁnyāsa*, is of three kinds (v. 4). Of these the abandonment (of works) of the *tāmasic* and the *rājasic* types has been mentioned. How can the abandonment of attachment and fruit be stated as the third type,—which is akin to saying: "Three brāhmaṇas have come; of them, two are learned in the auxiliary sciences, and the third is a kṣatriya"?[8]

Reply:—The objection has no force; since the purpose (of this section) is to extol one of the three which have abandonment as their common feature. There is indeed the general characteristic of 'abandonment' both in the relinqishment of action and in the abandonment of the thought of the fruit. And, of these, the relinquishment of the thought of the fruit of action is praised as *sāttvic* in the words, "Such relinqishment is regarded as *sattvic*" by condemning the abandonment of works themselves as *rājasic* and *tāmasic*.

8. While the first two relate to abandonment of action (itself), the Lord speaks of the third in a different way (the abandonment of *attachment to and fruit of* action) which is not opposite (according to the objector). (Ā). Just as a kṣatriya cannot be one among the brāhmaṇas, but forms a different category, so also, according to the objector, the two different categories of abandonment could not be grouped together.

And, for the man whose duty it is (to perform action) and who discharges the obligatory duties, leaving attachment and the desire for the fruit, his inner-sense (*antaḥ-karaṇā*), not getting befouled by attachment to the fruit etc.[9], and getting cleansed through (the performance of) obligatory rites, becomes pure. When pure and calm, it becomes competent for Self-reflection. Now, (therefore), with the intention of teaching how such a person, whose *antaḥ-karaṇa* has been purified by the performance of obligatory rites and who has turned towards Self-knowledge, may gradually[10] attain to fixity in Self-knowledge, the Lord says:

न द्वेष्ट्यकुशलं कर्म कुशले नानुषज्जते ।
त्यागी सत्त्वसमाविष्टो मेधावी छिन्नसंशयः ।। १० ।।

Na dveṣṭyakuśalam karma kuśale nānuṣajjate
Tyāgī sattva-samāviṣṭo medhāvī chinna-samśayaḥ

10. He hates not a disagreeable work, nor is attached to an agreeable one,—(such is) the relinquisher enduled with *Sattva* and a steady understanding, and with his doubts dispelled.

He hates not a disagreeale work, an action that is not good, namely kāmya-karma, which by producing a body (another birth) is the cause of transmigratory existence (saṁsāra); he does not abhor such disagreeable work, thinking, "Of what use is this?"; *nor is attached to an agreeable one*, a good action, namely nitya-karma (obligatory action), with the thought that it is the means to liberation (mokṣa) by purifying the sattva .antaḥ-karaṇa), generating Knowledge, and then leading to fixity in that Knowledge. That is to say, he sees no use in that also and does not get addicted to it.

Who is this person?

He is *the relinquisher*, he who is possessed of the merit of having abandoned attachment (to action) and desire for (its) fruits,

9. 'etc.' refers to the attachment to action itself. (Ā)

10. by the repeated practice of '*śravaṇa*' (hearing) etc. (Ā)

already referred to; he, who, having left the attachment to action and the desire for its fruit, performs the obligatory rites (nitya-karma).

And, when will he not hate a disagreeable work and be not attached to an agreeable one?

This will now be stated: It is when he is *endued with Sattva*, pervaded or possessed of Sattva, which is the means to the discriminative knowledge concerning the Self and the not-Self. As a consequence thereof, also when he becomes endued with *a steady understanding*, wisdom, characterised by Self-Knowledge; *and*, as a result of possessing steady understanding, *with his doubts dispelled*, with the doubts caused by ignorance (avidyā) dispelled by the conviction that to be established in the true nature of the Self is alone the supreme means to final beautitude and that there is no other means whatever.

.To sum up:) The man who has that duty, by practising Karma-Yoga in the manner stated, gradually attains refinement of (his) self (*antaḥ-karaṇa*); then he gets the perception that he himself is the Self, who being devoid of the modifications of birth etc., is actionless; and, he, renouncing "all actions by the mind" and staying "without at all acting or causing to act" (V. 13), attains to abidance in Knowledge, characterised by actionlessness. This, the result of Karma-Yoga described above, is what has been related in this verse.

On the other hand, that person whose duty lies in the performance of action, who remains ignorant, bearing a body by reason of esteeming the body as himself, whose conception that he is an agent not having been discarded, has the settled belief "I am the agent")—for him, because of the impossibility of abandoning all works, the duty is to perform the action enjoined by Scripture, leaving (the desire for) the fruit of action, and not the abandonment of action. Bringing out this import, the Lord says:

न हि देहभृता शक्यं त्यक्तुं कर्माण्यशेषतः ।
यस्तु कर्मफलत्यागी स त्यागीत्यभिधीयते ॥ ११ ॥

Na hi deha-bhṛtā śakyam tyaktum karmāṇyaśeṣataḥ
Yastu karma-phala-tyāgī sa tyāgītyabhidhīyate

11. It is indeed not possible for an embodied being to relinquish actions entirely; he who relinquishes the fruits of action is verily called a relinquisher.

Since *it is indeed not possible for an embodied being*,—he who identifies himself with the body is so called, and not the man of discrimination; for the latter, the status of being the agent of action is indeed denied in the verse. "He who knows This to be Indestructible" (II-21). So (we have to understand that) for the embodied being, namely the un-enlightened man, it is not possible *to relinquish actions entirely*, completely. Therefore, *he*, the un-enlightened man, whose duty is in the performance of action, and *who*, while performing the obligatory works, *relinquishes* just the thought of *the fruits of action, is verily called a relinquisher*, even though he is a performer of action. This is with the intention of praising (his conduct)[11].

From this, it is concluded that only by the seer of the Supreme Reality, who is no 'body-bearer', (that is to say) who is free from the thought that the body is the Self, is it possible to renounce all action completely.

What, then, is the benefit arising from the relinquishment of all action? This is being stated:

अनिष्टमिष्टं मिश्रं च त्रिविधं कर्मणः फलम् ।
भवत्यत्यागिनां प्रेत्य न तु संन्यासिनां क्वचित् ॥ १२ ॥

Aniṣṭam-iṣṭam miśram ca trividham karmaṇaḥ phalam
Bhavatyatyāginām pretya na tu saṁnyāsinām kvacit

11. Calling even a performer of action a relinquisher because of his relinquishment of the fruit (of the action), is for the purpose of lauding the relinquishment of the fruit. (Ā)

12. The threefold fruit of action—disagreeable, agreeable, and mixed,—accrues to the non-relinquishers, after death, but never to the renouncers (*saṁnyāsins*).

The three-fold, three sorts of, *fruit of action*, of the nature of dharma and adharma (i.e. righteous and un-righteous acts)—, *disagreeable*, such as hell, an animal-birth, etc., *agreeable*, such as Deva-birth, *and mixed*, blended of the agreeable and the disagreeable, such as a human-birth,—

Fruit (result, effect, meed) is the consummation brought about by the working of several external factors. It is a product of avidyā. It is like the illusion produced by jugglery ("Indra-jāla"), causing much amazement; seemingly inhering in the Innermost-Self (pratyagātman), but as the derivation of the word ("Phalam": (fruit) shows, passing into extinction, disappearing, because it is unsubstantial ("phalgu": sapless, "layam": extinction).

(Such) fruit of the (three) kinds *accrues to the non-relinquishers*, to the un-enlightened performers of karma, those who are not saṁnyāsins in the real sense[12], *after death*, the shedding of the body. *But* it *never* accrues *to the renouncers* in the real sense, the saṁnyāsins of the highest type (Paramahaṁsa-Parivrājakas), abiding exclusively in the path of Knowledge (jñāna-niṣṭha). The point is that those who are exclusively devoted to the perception of Truth can never fail to uproot the seed of saṁsāra, namely avidyā, and the rest.

It follws that the complete renunciation of all action is possible only for the seer of the Supreme Truth, since it is only through *avidyā* that action, its accessories, and fruit, are attributed to the Self; but complete renunciation of all action is not possible for the un-enlightened person, who sees the seat (body) etc., namely action, the agent, and accessories, as himself. All this, the Lord proceeds to teach in the succeeding verses.

पञ्चैतानि महाबाहो कारणानि निबोध मे ।
सांख्ये कृतान्ते प्रोक्तानि सिद्धये सर्वकर्मणाम् ॥ १३ ॥

12. For the performers of action without the desire for the result, the fruit pertaining to the action necessarily accrues. (Ā)

Pañcaitāni mahābāho kāraṇāni nibodha me
Sāṁkhye kṛtānte proktāni siddhaye sarva-
karmaṇām

13. Learn from Me, O mighty-armed, these five causes in the accomplishment of all works, as declared in the Sāṁkhya, which is the end of (all) action.

Learn from Me, O mighty-armed, these five, which will presently be mentioned, *causes* which function *in the accomplishment*, completion, *of all works.*

With a view to securing steadiness of mind (on the part of the hearer) with respect to what follows,[13] and indicating the difficulty of the subject-matter to be taught,[13] the Lord praises these 'causes' as worthy of being clearly understood (in the words)—*as declared in the Sāṁkhya*; Sāṁnkhya is Vedānta (the Upaniṣads), wherein (all) the things which are to be known are enumerated[14]; it is qualified by the epithet 'kṛtānta', meaning *the end of all action*, that wherein all action meets its end, completion; as has been taught by the Lord, in the passages, "What use there is in a reservoir, etc." (II.46), and, "All action in its entirety, O Pārtha, attains its consummation in Knowlege"(IV.33),that on the rise of Self-knowledge all action ceases. Therefore (is it said that) in that Sāṁkhya, the Vedānta, whose aim is Self-Knowledge, the end of all action, they (the five causes) have been declared to be for the accomplishment (completion) of all action.

What they are is now stated:

13. 'What follows refers to the 'seat' etc. (to be enumerated in verse 14); 'subject-matter' refers also to them; and the difficult subject-matter which is intended to be explained cannot be understood in the absence of 'steadiness of mind.' (Ā)

14. The fundamental categories (*padārthas*) to be known are: the Self (*Ātman*), the signification of the word '*Tvaṁ*'); Brahman, the signification of the word '*Tat*'; the understanding of their identity; and the means useful for the purpose' namely, hearing (*Sravaṇa*) etc. (Ā). The reference is to the *upaniṣadic* teaching "*Tat-tvam-asi*"; "That thou art" signifying the identity of the *jiva* (individual soul) and Brahman.

अधिष्ठानं तथा कर्ता करणं च पृथग्विधम् ।
विविधाश्च पृथक्चेष्टा दैवं चैवात्र पञ्चमम् ॥ १४ ॥

Adhiṣṭhānam tathā kartā karaṇam ca pṛthag-vidham
Vividhāśca pṛthak-ceṣṭā daivam caivātra pañcamam

14. The seat and the agent, and the various organs, and the different functions of a manifold kind, and the divinity also, the fifth among them.

The seat, that on which depends the manifestation of desire, hatred, pleasure, pain, knowledge, etc.,—namely the body.

and the agent, the enjoyer who partakes of the characteristics of the upādhi associated with him[15],

and the various organs such as the sense of hearing, for the perception of sound etc., functioning in several ways, and twelve in number[16],

—*and the different functions of a manifold kind* of the air ("vāyu"), such as breathing-in and breathing-out,

and the divinity also, such as Āditya (the Sun) and others, favouring the functioning of (the senses such as) the eye etc., *the fifth among them*, which with the (previous) four completes the five.

शरीरवाङ्मनोभिर्यत्कर्म प्रारभते नरः ।
न्याय्यं वा विपरीतं वा पञ्चैते तस्य हेतवः ॥ १५ ॥

Śarīra-vāṅg-manobhir-yat-karma-prārahhate naraḥ
Nyāyyam vā viparītam vā pañcaite tasya yetavaḥ

15. The '*upādhi*' (limiting adjunct) is the '*buddhi*' (intellect) etc.; and the enjoyer is he who is covered through perceiving the attributes of *buddhi* as belonging to himself, i.e. he whose form is mainly that of the *upādhi*. (Ā)

16. The five organs of sense (*jñāna-indriyas*), the five organs of action (*katma-indriyas*), the mind (*manas*), and the *buddhi*. (Ā)

15. Whatever action a man performs by the body, speech, and mind,—whether right, or the reverse,— these five are its causes.

Whatever action a man performs by these three, *the body, speech, and mind,—whether right*, consistent with dharma, conforming to the scriptures, *or the reverse*, opposed to the scriptures and to dharma,—*these five*, afore-mentioned, *are its causes*, are the cause of every action. Even those actions, such as the twinkling of the eye, which are the conditions of life, are comprehended by the terms, 'right, or the reverse,' inasmuch as they are merely the effect of acts of dharma and adharma performed in the past.

Objection:—The seat and the rest are the causes of every action. How is it then said that action is performed by the body, speech, and mind (alone)?

Reply:—The objection has no force. All action, whether prescribed or forbidden by scriptural injunction, concerns primarily the three, namely, the body, etc.; while seeing, hearing, etc., which are the (mere) marks of life, constitute a secondary part of that action[17]. Thus, classified under three groups, actions are said to be performed by the body, etc. Even at the time of fruition, the fruit of action is enjoyed by the primary causes (to which the senses are secondary). So there is no contradiction to all the five being the causes.

तत्रैवं सति कर्तारमात्मानं केवलं तु यः ।
पश्यत्यकृतबुद्धित्वान्न स पश्यति दुर्मतिः ॥ १६ ॥

Tatraivam sati kartāram-ātmānam kevalam tu yaḥ
Paśyatyakṛta-buddhitvān-na sa paśyati durmatiḥ

17. The eye etc., are secondary members of the primary causes, the body, mind and speech. The acts of seeing etc., which are the natural conditions of life, caused by them, and which are outside the scope of scriptural injunctions, are comprehended in the action of the body. (Ā)

16. Now, such being the case, he who, as possessed of a non-purified understanding, looks upon his Self, the Pure, as the agent, he of perverted intelligence sees not.

Now,—this word refers to the subject on hand,—*such being the case*, every action being thus executed by the five causes aforesaid,

(This has connection, in what follows, as the reason why the person referred to is considered perverse:)

he, the un-enlightened person, regarding himself as identical with them,[18] through ignorance (avidyā), and thinking "I am the doer" of the action performed by them, *who looks upon his Self, the Pure, as the agent*;—

Why does he think so?—because he is *possessed of a non-purified understanding*, an understanding that has not been refined by the (study of the) Vedanta, the teaching of the Preceptor, and reasoning.

Even he who holds that the Self is different from the body etc., but looks upon the Self (different from them) which is (really) Pure, as the agent, is a man of non-prufied understanding. Therefore,

he sees not the truth about the Self, or about action. Consequently, he is a man *of perverted intelligence*; his intelligence is contemptible, wrong, and vicious, leading to the perpetual acquisition of birth and death; though seeing, he sees not (truly), like a man who, affected with (the eye-disease) "timira" sees many moons, or like him who regards the moon as moving when the clouds move, or like him who seated in a vehicle thinks himself as advancing forward when others (the bearers) are advancing[19].

18. the seat etc. (A)

19. Just as the man affected with *timira* in his eye, through seeing several moons, sees not the moon in truth, the un-enlightened man, even though seeing 'himself' as the agent, does not see himself in his true form. The next analogy brings out how on the Self, which is regarded as connected with the 'seat' etc. through ignorance, their activity is super-imposed. And, just as a person seated in a vehicle believes himself, through want of discrimination, to be the principal performer of the act of moving forward, which is effected by others, namely the bearers, so also when the 'seat' etc. are the performers of action, he who regards the Self, which is in their midst, as the agent has a perverted intelligence. (A)

Who, then, is the wise man who sees righty? The answer follows:

यस्य नाहंकृतो भावो बुद्धिर्यस्य न लिप्यते ।
हत्वाऽपि स इमाँल्लोकान्न हन्ति न निबध्यते ॥ १७ ॥

Yasya nāhaṁkṛto bhāvo buddhir-yasya na lipyate
Hatvā(a)pi sa imāṁ-lokān-na hanti na nibadhyate

17. He who is free from egotistic notion, whose intelligence is not tainted,—though he kills these worlds,he kills not, nor is he bound.

He, the person whose understanding has been refined by the (study of the) Śāstra, the teaching of the Preceptor, and reasoning, and *who is free from egotistic notion*, to whom the conception, of the form "I am the doer", does not occur, who perceives that, "these five alone, the seat etc., which are ascribed to the Self through avidyā, are the performers of all actions; and not I. I, on the other hand, am the (mere) witness of their actions, 'without breath (Prāṇa), without mind, pure, higher than the Indestructible which is Supreme' (Mu. II.i.2), the Perfect, the Immutable"; *whose intelligence*, inner-sense (antaḥ-karaṇa) which forms an upādhi of the Self, *is not tainted*, by regretful thoughts such as, "I have done this; and so I shall go to hell (naraka)"; a man of the foregoing description is the wise man; he sees rightly;—*though he kills these worlds*, all living creatures, *he kills not*, he does not perform the act of killing, *nor is he bound* either, by the fruit of adharma, which is the (normal) consequence of that act.

Objection:—Even if it is meant (merely) as a praise, it is mutually contradictory to say "though he kills" and "he kills not".

Reply:—This objection cannot stand, since the statement is proper, when viewed from the wordly and the absolute standpoints (conjoined together). Following the worldly standpoint, which considers, "I am the killer", as a result of identifying the body etc. with the Self, the Lord says, "though he kills"; and from the standpoint of the absolute truth already expounded, He

says " He kills not, nor is bound"; thus both (statements) are proper.

Objection:—From the employment of the word 'pure' in the statement, "he who looks upon his Self, the Pure, as the agent.." (verse 16) does it not follow that the Self, united with the 'seat' etc., does perform action?

Reply:—The objection is not valid; for, it is impossible for the Self to get united with the 'seat' etc., since He (the Self) is by nature immutable. Only that which is subject to modification can enter into combination with others, and when so combined become an agent. But, for the Self, who is immutable, there can be no combination with anything whatever, and therefore He cannot be an agent acting in combination. Therefore, since 'remaining isolated (unmingled, pure, "*kevalatva*") is the natural state of the Self, the employment of the word 'Pure' is merely by way of reference to it.

And, the immutability of the Self is well-known from *Śruti*, *Smṛti*, and reasoning. Indeed, it has been established repeatedly in the *Gītās*, in such passages as: "This Self is said to be unchangeable" (II.25), "Actions are everywhere performed by the *Guṇas*" (III.27), "Though existing in the body It neither acts......" (XIII. 31), And, in the *Śrutis*, in such passages as, "It meditates as it were, It moves as it were" (*Bṛ*.IV.iii.7). Through reasoning also, it is established thus: the Self is without parts, is not dependent on anything else, and is immutable[20]; and this (course of reasoning) is the royal rad (*rāja-mārga*; beyond dispute).

Even if the Self be supposed to be subject to modification, that modification could only be one inherent in Himself. The actions of the 'seat' etc. cannot be the doings of he Self, since it is indeed not proper to spuriously ascribe the action of one to another who has not done it. Also, what is attributed through *avidyā* cannot be His (in reality). Just as silver-ness cannot be the mother-of-pearl's, or the possession of a surface and dirt, ascribed by children through *avidyā*, cannot (really) pertain to space (*ākāśa*).

20. Since the Self is without parts, like space (*ākāsa*), it does not change of itself; it cannot also be modified by others, because that which is unattached and actionless cannot be subservient to another. (Ā)

so also the modifications of the 'seat' etc. belong to them alone, and not to the Self[21].—Therefore, it has rightly been said that, because of the absence of the taint, "I am the doer" from his understanding, the wise man neither kills nor is bound.

Having made the solemn declaration, "It does not slay, nor is It slain" (II-19), having stated that the Self is immutable by pointing out the reason therefor in the words, "This is never born, etc." (II.20), having briefly taught at the beginning of the (*Gītā*) *Śāstra* that there is no duty to perform actions in the case of the man of Wisdom, in the verse, "He who knows This to be indestructible" (II.21), and having introduced the subject here and there in the middle and discussed it intently, the Lord concludes the subject here that the wise man "kills not, nor is bound" by way of summing up the import of the (*Gītā*) *Śāstra*.

Thus, to be *saṁnyāsins*, in whose case (alone) it is possible to renounce completely all actions which are the effect of *avidyā*, because they are incapable of regarding themselves as bearers of the body, it is appropriate that the three-fold fruit of action—the disagreeable etc.—does not accrue; and it is irrefutable that in the case of others,who are quite the contrary, the fruit of action will accrue:

Thus, has the teaching of the *Gītā-Śāstra* been concluded here.

This itself is also the essence of the teaching of all the Vedas, which should be reflected upon and accepted by wise men of acute intelligence.

Just with this view has it been explained by us, here and there in several sections, in accordance with Scripture (*Śāstra*) and reasoning.

*

21. If the Self be subject to modification, that must depend on the Self itself, or on the 'seat' etc. It has already been shown that the Self cannot be subject to modification of itself. The other alternative is thus refuted; Does the action of the 'seat' etc. go to the Self in fact, or is it ascribed to the Self through *avidyā*? Not the first, because it is unthinkable (as explained in the text), nor the second because such ascription cannot make the action that of the Self, as illustrated by the two examples. (Ā)

Now is mentioned (all) that which prompts action:

ज्ञानं ज्ञेयं परिज्ञाता त्रिविधा कर्मचोदना ।
करणं कर्म कर्तेति त्रिविधः कर्मसंग्रहः ॥ १८ ॥

Jñānam jñeyam parijñātā trividhā karma-codanā
Karaṇam karma karteti trividhaḥ karma-saṁgrahaḥ

18. Knowledge, the known, (and) the knower (form) the three-fold prompter of action. The instrument, the object, and the agent are the threefold basis of action.

Knowledge, that by which anything becomes known; any knowledge, knowledge in general, is referred to; so also, *the known*, the object of knowledge, referring to objects in general, to all objects of all knowledge; and similarly *the knower*, the experiencer characterised by the upādhi, and an imaginary product of avidyā; this triad forms *the threefold prompter of* all *action*, action in general.

Indeed, only when there is a conjunction of the three, knowledge etc., is the performance of any action, with the object of avoiding (something) or getting (something), etc.[22] possible.

Consequently, the actions begun by the five, the 'seat' etc., and grouped in three classes according as they depend on speech, mind, or body, are comprehended in the three, the instrument etc.: this is what is being taught[23] (forthwith):

The instrument, that by which something is done; the external instruments being the organ of hearing etc., and the internal instruments being buddhi (intelligence) etc; *the object*, that (purpose) which is most desired, and which is obtained by the action of the agent; *and the agent*, he who employs the instruments in action, characterised by the upādhi (in which he functions), *are the threefold basis of action*:—that in which something is comprehended is its basis; in these three, action indeed inheres; and so the basis of action is threefold.

22. 'etc.' refers to 'keeping indifferent'. (Ā)

23. in the second half of the verse. (Ā)

And now, since action, its factors, and the fruit are all made up of the *guṇas*, it is necessary to mention the threefold distinction of each of them in accordance with the three *guṇas*, (viz.,) *Sattva*, *Rajas*, and *Tamas*; hence that (topic) is proceeded with.

ज्ञानं कर्म च कर्ता च त्रिधैव गुणभेदतः ।
प्रोच्यते गुणसंख्याने यथावच्छृणु तान्यपि ।। १९ ।।

Jñānam karma ca kartā ca tridhaiva guṇa-bhedataḥ
Procyate guṇa-saṁkhyāne yathāvacchṛṇu tānyapi

19. Knowledge, and action, and the agent are declared in the "Science of Guṇas" to be of three kinds only, from the distinction of the *guṇas*: hear also duly.

Knowledge, add action: 'karma' here means 'action',—not 'that which is most desired', the object of action, which is the technical sense of the word,—*and the agent*, the performer of actions, *are declared*, stated, *in the "Science of Guṇas"*, Kapila's system of philosophy[24], *to be of three kinds only, from the distinction of the guṇas*, such as Sattva.

The limitation to three only is to show that there is no distinction of any kind other than that caused by the (three) gunas.

Kapila's "Science of Gunas" is certainly an authority on the subject of guṇas and the enjoyer, though it is opposed to us[25] as regards the supreme Truth, the One-ness (non-duality) of Brahman. They, the followers of Kapila, are indeed proficient in the investigation of the functions of the guṇas and of their products, and so their Science (philosophy) is also accepted as authority, with a

24. i.e. *Sāṁkya darśana*, one of the six philosophies. But in the *Gītā*, the Lord uses the term "*Sāṁkhya*". II.39, (III.3, V. 5, XIII.24, XVIII. 13) to denote another of the Philosophies, *Vedānta*, with its Path of Knowledge, to which our Comentator belongs; See Com. preceding II. 11.

25. i.e. Vedāntians, who are followers of Vedānta, also called' *uttara mimamsa*.

view to praising the teaching which follows[26]; there is no harm in this.

Hear them also duly, bestow attention of mind to what is going to be said concerning knowledge and the rest, and their distinctions caused by the difference in guṇas, according to reason, according to the Śāstra (Science).

First, follows the three-fold difference in knowledge:

सर्वभूतेषु येनैकं भावमव्ययमीक्षते ।
अविभक्तं विभक्तेषु तज्ज्ञानं विद्धि सात्त्विकम् ॥ २० ॥

Sarva-bhūteṣu yenaikam bhāvam-avyayam-īkṣate
Avibhaktam vibhakteṣu taj-jñānam viddhi, sāttvikam

20. That by which one sees the One Indestructible Substance (Reality) in all beings, inseparate in the separated, know that Knowledge to be *sāttvic*.

That knowledge *by which one sees the One Indestructible Substance*,—'Bhāva' (Substance) means 'Reality'—, the Reality, that is, the One Self, which cannot be reduced or changed, either in itself or in attributes, the eternally immutable (kūṭastha), *in all beings*, from Avyakta down to unmoving objects; and sees that "Self-Reality' *inseparate*, not different, *in the separated*, in the mutually different bodies; like space (ākāśa) it is constant, admitting of no difference; *know that Knowledge*, the direct perception of the non-dual Self, *to be Sāttvic*, to be the Right (Plenary) Knowledge.

The dualistic systems of philosophy which are eerroneous are rājasic and tāmasic; consequently they cannot directly lead to the destruction of saṁsāra.

पृथक्त्वेन तु यज्ज्ञानं नानाभावान्पृथग्विधान् ।
वेत्ति सर्वेषु भूतेषु तज्ज्ञानं विद्धि राजसम् ॥ २१ ॥

26. The 'praise' consists in the fact that the matter which the Lord wants to teach is acclaimed even in a different system of Philosophy. (Ā). What the Lord wants to teach is Vedanta.

Pṛthaktvena tu yaj-jñānam nānā-bhāvān pṛthagvidhān
Vetti sarveṣu bhūteṣu taj-jñānam viddhi rājasam

21. But that knowledge, which sees as different from one another, various entities of distinct kinds, in all beings, that knowledge know as *rājasic*.

But that knowledge which sees, understands, *as different from one another*, as being distinct, in every body, each from (every one of) the others, *various entities*, souls, *of distinct kinds*, of different sorts, each having a distinct characteristic, *in all beings*,

—*that knowledge, know as rājasic*, as the effect of Rajas.

Since knowledge cannot be the agent (of any act), the expression, 'knowledge which sees' means 'knowledge by which one understands.'

यत्तु कृत्स्नवदेकस्मिन्कार्ये सक्तमहैतुकम् ।
अतत्त्वार्थवदल्पं च तत्तामसमुदाहृतम् ॥ २२ ॥

Yat-tu kṛtsnavad-ekasmin-kārye saktam-ahaitukam
Atattvārthavad-alpam ca tat-tāmasam-udāhṛtam

22. But that which sticks to one single effect as if it were the whole, without reason, without foundation in truth, and trivial,—that is declared to be *tāmasic*.

But that knowledge *which sticks to one single effect*, such as the body, or an external object such as an image, *as if it were the whole*, as though it is the all, all-comprehensive, thinking that "this much is the Self, (or) this is God, and, there is nothing beyond that"—

For instance, the naked Śramaṇas (Kṣapaṇakas)[27] think that the Jīva (soul) residing in the body is of the size of the body, and

27. The Jains.

some others hold that Īśvara is simply the stone or wood[28],—in that manner such knowledge sticks to one single effect;

It is *without reason*, not based on proof, *without foundation in truth*, not having a true matter (the real fact) as the object (of that understanding); *and* because it is not founded on reason, *trivial*, as relating to a trifling subject, or as producing petty results;

that (understanding) *is declared to be tāmasic*, because in tāmasic beings, wanting in discrimination, is this kind of knowledge met with.

Next, the three-fold nature of action is stated:

नियतं सङ्गरहितमरागद्वेषतः कृतम् ।
अफलप्रेप्सुना कर्म यत्तत्सात्त्विकमुच्यते ।। २३ ।।

Niyatam samga-rahitam-arāga-dveṣataḥ kṛtam
Alphala-prepsunā karma yat-tat-sāttvikam-ucyate

23. An ordained action,which is free from attachment, which is done without love or hatred, by one, not desirous of the fruit,—that (action) is declared to be *sāttvic*.

An ordained action, i.e. obligatory action, *which is free from*, devoid of, *attachment*, and *which is done without love or hatred*, which is not an action done by a person who is prompted by attachment or hatred, *by one*, a doer, agent, who is *not desirous of*, eager for, *the fruit*,—action *is declared to be sāttvic*.

यत्तु कामेप्सुना कर्म साहंकारेण वा पुनः ।
क्रियते बहुलायासं तद्राजसमुदाहृतम् ॥ २४ ॥

Yat-tu kāmepsunā karma sāhaṁkāreṇa vā punaḥ
Kriyate bahulāyāsam tad-rājasam-udāhṛtam

28. The material of the image.

24. But the action which is performed, by one desiring pleasures, or again by one having egotism, with much trouble, that is declared to be *rājasic*.

But the action which is performed, by one desiring pleasures, the fruits (of action), *or again by one having egotism*: the reference is not to a person contra-distinguished from the man of true wisdom[29], but to one different from a man of the world, (i.e. to the one who is) learned in the Vedas, and free from self-conceit. Because, for him who is free from egotism in the true sense, the knower of the Self, there is no possibility of his desiring pleasures or doing action with much trouble.

Even of sāttvic action, the doer is only the un-enlightened man who has got egotism (idea of being the agent); muchmore so in the case of rājasic and tāmasic (actions).

In wordly usage, even though not knowing the Self, a person learned in the Vedas is spoken of as free from egotism (self-conceit), in the words, "This Brāhmaṇa is un-egotistic (modest)". Therefore, it is only as distinguished from such a person that the doer of rājasic action is referred to as 'one having egotism'. The word 'again' ("punaḥ") is for completing the (second) quarter (of the verse).

Action performed by such doer *with much trouble,* with great exertion, *is declred to be rājasic.*

अनुबन्धं क्षयं हिंसामनपेक्ष्य च पौरुषम् ।
मोहादारभ्यते कर्म यत्तत्तामसमुच्यते ॥ २५ ॥

Anubandham kṣayam himsām-anapekṣya ca pauruṣam
Mohād-arābhyate karma yat-tat-tāmasam ucyate

25. The action which is undertaken through delusion, without heed to the consequence, loss, injury, and ability,—that is declared to be *tāmasic*.

29. This is to dispel the idea that the contrast is between the man of true. Wisdom who is devoid of egotism, and the un-enlightened man who is egotistic (Ā)

The action which is undertaken through delusion, lack of judgment, *without heed to the consequence* which would result later from it, *loss* energy and wealth involved in the performance of that act, *injury* to living beings, *and ability*, one's own capacity for exertion needed to bring the act to completion,—heedless of all these—*that is declared to be tāmasic*, effected by Tamas.

Now, the distinction among agents is spoken of:—

मुक्तसङ्गोऽनहंवादी धृत्युत्साहसमन्वितः ।
सिद्ध्यसिद्ध्योर्निर्विकारः कर्ता सात्त्विक उच्यते ॥ २६ ॥

Mukta-saṁgo(a)nahamvādī dhṛtyutsāha-samanvitaḥ
Siddhya-siddhyor-nirvikāraḥ kartā sāttvika ucyate

26. Free from attachment, not given to egotism, endued with fortitude and enthusism, and unaffected in success and failure, (such) an agent is said to be *sāttvic*.

Free from attachment, he by whom attachment[30] has been abandoned, *not given to egotism*, who is not given to saying, "I have done this", who is *endued with fortitude*, steadiness, courage, *and enthusiasm*, perseverance, *unaffected in success and failure*: whether there is the attainment of the fruit of the action performed or not, he is unaffected, because he is prompted (to the action in question) only by the authority of the Scripture and not by the desire for the fruit etc.[31]; (*such*) *an agent*, he who is this description, *is said to be sāttvic.*

रागी कर्मफलप्रेप्सुर्लुब्धो हिंसात्मकोऽशुचिः ।
हर्षशोकान्वितः कर्ता राजसः परिकीर्तितः ॥ २७ ॥

Rāgī karma-phala-prepsur-lubdho himsātmako-(a)śuciḥ
Harṣa-śokānvitaḥ kartā rājasaḥ parikīrtitaḥ

30. attachment: the desire for the fruit of action and the conceit of being the agent. (Ā)

31. 'etc.' refers to attachment to the act itself. (Ā)

27. Passionate, desirous of the fruits of action, greedy, destructive, impure, affected by elation and dejection, such an agent is called *rājasic*.

He who is *passionate*, *desirous of*, intent on, *the fruits of action*, *greedy*, thirsting for another's property, and not giving away his own property in holy places to worthy persons, etc., *destructive*, bent on doing harm to others, *impure*, devoid of external and internal purity, *affected by elation and dejection*, rejoicing on the attainment of what is desirable, and feeling sorry on getting what is not desirable or on the deprivation of what was held dear;—these, elation and dejection, arise in him at the success or failure of the action engaged in by himself;—*such an agent is called rājasic*.

अयुक्तः प्राकृतः स्तब्धः शठो नैष्कृतिकोऽलसः ।
विषादी दीर्घसूत्री च कर्ता तामस उच्यते ॥ २८ ॥

Ayuktaḥ prākṛtaḥ stabdhaḥ śaṭho naiṣkṛtiko(a)tasaḥ
Viṣādī dīrgha-sūtrī ca kartā tāmasa ucyate

28. Unsteady, vulgar, arrogant, dishonest, malicious, indolent, desponding, and procrastinating, such an agent is called *tāmasic*.

Unsteady, not intent (on the action), *vulgar*, extremely uncultured in intellect (buddhi) and behaving childishly, *arrogant*, not bowing to anybody, being unbending like a stick, *dishonest*, deceitful, concealing his real capacity, *malicious*, intent on destroying the business of others, *indolent*, not inclined to engage even in actions which ought to be done, *desponding*, always in drooping spirits, *and procrastinating*, postponing for long what ought to be done, not doing in a month what ought to be done today or tomorrow;—*such na agent*, an agent of this description, *is called tāmasic*.

बुद्धेर्भेदं धृतेश्चैव गुणतस्त्रिविधं शृणु ।
प्रोच्यमानमशेषेण पृथक्त्वेन धनञ्जय ॥ २९ ॥

Buddher-bhedam dhṛteścaiva guṇatas-trividham śṛṇu
Procyamānam-aśeṣeṇa pṛthaktvena Dhanañjaya

29. The triple distinction of intellect and of fortitude according to the *guṇas*, about to be taught exhaustively and severally (by Me), do you hear, O Dhanañjaya!

The triple distinction of intellect and (the triple) distinction *of fortitude, according to the guṇas,* Sattva and the rest—this first half of the verse sets out in aphoristic form (what is going to be taught);- *about to be taught,* declared, *exhaustively,* duly without leaving out any detail, *and severally,* distinctively, (by Me), *do you hear, O Dhanañjaya,* conqueror of welth. Arjuna won immense wealth, human and divine, during his conquest of various countries in all directions ("dig-vijaya"); therefore, he is so called.

प्रवृत्तिं च निवृत्तिं च कार्याकार्ये भयाभये ।
बन्धं मोक्षं च या वेत्ति बुद्धिः सा पार्थ सात्त्विकी ।। ३० ।।

Pravṛttim ca nivṛttim ca kāryākārye bhayābhaye
Bandham mokṣam ca yā vetti buddhiḥ sā Pārtha sāttvikī

30. That which knows action and inaction, right action and wrong action, fear and fearlessness, bondage and liberation, that intellect, O Pārtha, is *sāttvic*.

That which knows action, "pravṛtti", which leads to bondage, the path of Works, *and inaction,* "nivṛtti", which leads to Mokṣa (Liberation), the path of Saṁnyāsa.—

As "pravṛtti" and "nivṛtti" occur in the same sentence signifying bondage and liberation, they are to be (respectively) understood as referring to the path of Works (Karma) and the path of Renunciation (Saṁnyāsa)—

right action and wrong action, what ought to be done, i.e. that which is enjoined, and what ought not to be done, i.e. that which is prohibited. To what is this reference? To performance and non-performance of actions producing visible and invisible results, having regard to place, time, etc.

fear, namely, that from which one fears, i.e. the cause of fear, *and fearlessness*, its opposite, the cause of fearlessness,—with regard to visible and invisible matters;

bondage, together with its cause, *and liberation*, with its cause;

that intellect which knows all these, *O Pārtha, is sāttvic.*

Here knowledge[32] is a function (vṛtti) of the intellect (buddhi), and buddhi is that which functions, passing through various states. Fortitude (dhṛti) is also only a particular function (state) of the intellect (buddhi).

यया धर्ममधर्मं च कार्यं चाकार्यमेव च ।
अयथावत्प्रजानाति बुद्धिः सा पार्थ राजसी ॥ ३१ ॥

Yayā dharmam-adharmam ca kāryam cākāryam-eva ca
Ayathāvat-prajānāti buddhiḥ sā Pārtha rājasī

31. That by which one apprehends *dharma* and *adharma*, and also right action and wrong action, in a distorted way, that intellect, O Pārtha, is rājasic.

That by which one apprehends dharma, i.e. what is ordained by Scripture (Sastra) (as virtue), *and adharma*, i.e. what is prohibited by Scripture (as vice), *and also right action and wrong action*, which have been already explained (in the previous verse)[33], *in a distorted*

32. The threefold nature of knowledge has already been described (in verses 20 to 22). It is therefore stated here that knowledge is different from *buddhi*, whose threefold nature, is now described. (Ā)

33. '*kārya*' (right action) and '*akārya*' (wrong action) refer to the performance and the non-performance of actions which are intended to produce visible and invisible result, while '*dharma*' (virtue) and '*adharma*' (vice) refer to the '*apūrva*', and are thus different from the latter. (Ā). *Apūrva*: the remote consequences of an act with virtue and vice as their cause. See also footnote 32 in Chap. III.

way, not in the proper manner in all respects, (as determined everywhere, i.e. by all authorities), *that intellect, O Pārtha, is rājasic.*

अधर्मं धर्ममिति या मन्यते तमसाऽऽवृता ।
सर्वार्थान्विपरीतांश्च बुद्धिः सा पार्थ तामसी ॥ ३२ ॥

Adharmam dharmam-iti yā manyate tamasā(ā)vṛtā
Sarvārthān-viparītāṁśca buddhiḥ sā Pārtha tāmasī

32. That which, enveloped in darkness, regards *adharma* as *dharma*, and all things contrariwise, that intellect, O Pārtha, is tāmasic.

That which, being *enveloped in darkness, regards*, understands, *adharma*, that which is prohibited, *as dharma*, as enjoined by Scripture, *and all things*, matters to be known[34], *contrariwise*; —it always views them all in a perverted light;—*that intellect, O Pārtha, is tāmasic.*

धृत्या यया धारयते मनः प्राणेन्द्रियक्रियाः ।
योगेनाऽव्यभिचारिण्या धृतिः सा पार्थ सात्त्विकी ॥ ३३ ॥

Dhṛtyā yayā dhārayate manaḥ prāṇendriya-kriyāḥ
Yogenāvyabhicāriṇyā dhṛtiḥ sā Pārtha sattvikī

33. The fortitude by which the functions of the mind, the *prāṇas* (vital airs), and the senses, are maintained, that (fortitude), unswerving from *Yoga*, O Pārtha, is *sāttvic*.

The fortitude by which—this is to be connected with the word, 'unswerving', appearing later—*are maintained*, regulated;

What (are regulated)?—*the functions*, the activities, *of the mind, the prāṇas, and the senses*: these are regulated, restrained

34. This includes '*kārya*' and '*akārya*' etc. (mentioned in the previous verse). (Ā)

from proceeding in ways contrary to Scripture (Śāstra); it is only when they are regulated by fortitude (of the intellect, "buddhi") that they will not proceed along ways opposed to Scripture;

that (i.e. such) fortitude, which is *unswerving from Yoga* i.e. ever accompanying samādhi, concentration of mind.—

The meaning is: he who by unswerving fortitude (of intellect) maintains (regulates) the activities of the mind, the prāṇas, and the senses, maintains them by Yoga[35].—

fortitude of this description, *O Pārtha, is sāttvic.*

यया तु धर्मकामार्थान्धृत्या धारयतेऽर्जुन ।
प्रसङ्गेन फलाकाङ्क्षी धृतिः सा पार्थ राजसी ॥ ३४ ॥

YaYā tu dharma-kāmārthān dhṛtyā dhārayate(A)rjuna
Prasaṅgena phalākāṁkṣī dhṛtiḥ sā Pārtha rājasī

34. But the fortitude by which one holds fast to *dharma*, pleasures, and wealth, desirous of the fruit of each on its occasion, that fortitude, O Pārtha, is *rājasic*.

But the fortitude by which one holds fast to dharma, pleasures and wealth, settles in his mind that they are always to be accomplished, and becomes *desirous of the fruit of each on its occasion*, whenever one of them, dharma, etc., engages his attention, *that fortitude*, of such a person, *O Pārtha, is rājasic.*

यया स्वप्नं भयं शोकं विषादं मदमेव च ।
न विमुञ्चति दुर्मेधा धृतिः सा तामसी मता ॥ ३५ ॥

Yayā svapnam bhayam śokam viṣādam madam-eva ca
Na vimuñcati dur-medhā dhṛtiḥ sā tāmasī matā

35. One who is able to maintain (regulate) the said activities does so by *Yoga*, by that fortitude which is unswerving, inseparable from *samādhi*, concentration of mind on Brahman. In the absence of such inseparableness, it will be impossible to maintain them by mere fortitude. (Ā)

35. That by which a stupid man does not give up sleep, fear, grief, despondency, and also lust, that fortitude, O Pārtha, is held to be *tāmasic*.

That by which a stupid man, a person of contemptible thoughts, *does not give*, but holds fast to, *sleep, fear*, alarm, *grief*[36], *despondency*, loss of spirit, dejection[37], *and also lust*, addiction to sense-pleasure, considering sensual gratification as highly estimable for himself, like an intoxicated man,—and thinks that all these are always proper objects for indulgence, *that fortitude* of such a man, *O Pārtha, is held to be tāmasic.*

The threefold division of actions, and of the factors of action (*kārakas*), according to the difference in *guṇas*, has been stated. Now, then, will be explained the threefold distinction of happiness, which is the effect (of actions).

सुखं त्विदानीं त्रिविधं शृणु मे भरतर्षभ ।
अभ्यासाद्रमते यत्र दुःखान्तं च निगच्छति ।। ३६ ।।

Sukham tvidānīm tri-vidham śṛṇu me Bharatarṣabha
Abhyāsād-ramate yatra duḥkhāntam ca nigacchati

36. And now hear from Me, O Bull of the Bhāratas, of the three-fold happiness, in which one delights by practice, and surely comes to the end of pain.

And now, hear from Me, devote concentrated attention to My words, *O Bull of the Bhāratas*, (concerning) *the three-fold happiness, in which*, in the enjoyment of which, *one delights*, gets pleasure, *by practice* familiarity, frequent repetition, *and surely comes*, certainly attains, *to the end of pain*, the cessation of pain.

यत्तदग्रे विषमिव परिणामेऽमृतोपमम् ।
तत्सुखं सात्त्विकं प्रोक्तमात्मबुद्धिप्रसादजम् ।। ३७ ।।

36. anguish caused by separation from (or deprivation of) an object of enyjoy ment. (Ā)

37. fatigue of the sense-organs. (Ā)

Yat-tad-agre viṣam-iva pariṇāme(a)mṛtopamam
TaI-sukham sāttvikam proktam-ātma-buddhi-prasādajam

37. That which is like poison at first, (but) like nectar at the end;—that happiness is declared to be *sāttvic* (because it is) born of the transparency of one's own intellect (or born of the propitiousness of Self-Knowledge).

That happiness *which is like poison at first* initially, on its first occurrence; it is painful, since it is preceded by extreme exertion in the initial stages of acquiring Knowledge (jñāna), indifference to the world (vairāgya), dhyāna, and samādhi; but *at the end*, the happiness arising on the fruition of knowledge, indifference and the rest, is *like nectar;—that happiness is declared to be sāttvic* by the wise, because it is, *born of the transparency of one's own intellect*, born of the spolessness, lucidity as of (pure) water, of one's own intellect—or (to give another interpretation), *born of* the intensity of *the propitiousness of Self-Knowledge*, the Knowledge concerning the Self, i.e. resting on the Self.[38]

विषयेन्द्रियसंयोगाद्यत्तदग्रेऽमृतोपमम् ।
परिणामे विषमिव तत्सुखं राजसं स्मृतम् ॥ ३८ ॥

Viṣayendriya-saṁyogād-yat-tad-agre-(a)mrtopamam
Pariṇāme viṣam iva tat-sukham rājasam smṛtam

38. That which (arising) from the contact of object with sense, is at first like nectar, (but) at the end is like poison, that happiness is declared to be *rājasic*.

That happiness *which* arising *from the contact of object with sense*, which *is at first*, at the earliest moment, *like nectar*, but *at*

38. In the first interpretation, "*ātma-buddhi-praṣāda*" is explained as: "*ātma*": one's own, "*buddhi*": intellect, "*prasāda*": transparency. In the second as: "*ātma*": Self, "*buddhi*": Knowledge, "*prāsada*": propitiousness. In both "jam" means "born of".

the end, after it has been completely enjoyed, *is like poison*, because it produces loss of strength, valour, beauty of form, wisdom, retentive memory, wealth, and enthusiasm, as also because it leads to adharma, and its consequence, hell etc.;—*thaI happiness is declared to be rājasic.*

यदग्रे चानुबन्धे च सुखं मोहनमात्मनः ।
निद्रालस्यप्रमादोत्थं तत्तामसमुदाहृतम् ॥ ३९ ॥

Yad-agre cānubandhe ca sukham mohanam-ātmanaḥ
Nidrālasya-pramādottham tat-tāmasam-udāhṛtam

39. That happiness which (both) in the beginning and in the sequel is delusive to the self, arising from sleep, indolence, and negligence (misconception), that is declared to be *tāmasic.*

That happiness which in the beginning, and in the sequel, subsequent to its termination, *is delusive*, produces delusion (confusion) *to the self*, in oneself, and which *arises*, springs up, *from sleep indolence and negligence* (misconception),—*that is declared to be tāmasic.*

Now, then, follows the verse which concludes the subject on hand[39];

न तदस्ति पृथिव्यां वा दिवि देवेषु वा पुनः ।
सत्त्वं प्रकृतिजैर्मुक्तं यदेभिः स्यात्त्रिभिर्गुणैः ॥ ४० ॥

Na tad-asti pṛthivyām vā divi deveṣu vā punaḥ
Sattvam prakṛtijair-muktamyad-ebhiḥ syāt-tribhir-guṇaiḥ

40. There is no entity on earth, or again in heaven among the devas, that is devoid of these three *guṇas*, born of *Prakṛti.*

39. namely, that the entire transmigratory existence (*saṁsāra*) is tainted by the three *Guṇas*. (Ā)

There is no entity, animate creature, or the other, (namely inanimate creature, *on earth*, among men and the others, *or again in heaven among the devas, that is*, that can exist, *devoid of*, freed from, *these three guṇas*, Sattva and the rest, *born of Prakṛti.*

*

The entire transmigratory existence (saṁsāra), which is manifested in the form of actions, instruments of action, and effects, made up of the *guṇas—Sattva, Rajas*, and *Tamas*—fashioned by *Avidyā*, this evil has thus been described, together with its root. It has also been described by the imagery of a tree in the passage, "With the roots above", etc. (XV.1 et. seq). And, it has been stated that "having cut asunder this (tree) with the strong axe of non-attachment, then, that Goal is to be sought for" (XV. 3 and 4).

Since it may be thought that, because everything is made up of the three *guṇas*, there is no possibility of bringing about the cessation of saṁsāra[40]; it is now necessary to state the means by which its cessation can be effected. Also with the object of summing up the entire teaching of the *Gītā-śāstra*, and also of showing that the entire teaching of the Vedas and the Smṛtis which has to be followed by those who desire to attain the highest object of human birth is only this much, the following section beginning with "Of Brāhmaṇas, and Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas", is commenced:

ब्राह्मणक्षत्रियविशां शूद्राणां च परन्तप ।
कर्माणि प्रविभक्तानि स्वभावप्रभवैर्गुणैः ॥ ४१ ॥

Brāhmaṇa-kṣatriya-viśām śūdrāṇām ca parantapa
Karmāṇi pravibhaktāni svabhāva-prabhavair-guṇaiḥ

41. Of Brāhmaṇās, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas, as also of Śūdras, the duties are distributed, according to the *guṇas*, born of nature, O scorcher of foes!

Of Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas, as also of Śūdras,—these (i.e. Śūdras) are not grouped with the others, because they

40. since *Prakṛti*, made up of the three *guṇas*, is eternal. (Ā)

have only one birth[41], and, consequently, cannot study the Vedas,—*the duties are distributed,* settled for each class, disjunctively as between one another:—

On what principle?

according to the guṇas, born of nature, O Scorcher of foes!

Nature (*Svabhāva*) is Īśvara's *Prakṛti*, the *Māyā* made up of the three *guṇas*; the *Māyā* that is the source (origin) of the *guṇas.* In accordance with them (the *guṇas*), the duties, such as (are associated with) tranquillity of the mind, have been distributed to Brāhmaṇas and others.

Or (to give another interpretation), the source, cause, of the Brāhmaṇa's nature is the *guṇa* of *Sattva*; so also, the source of the Kṣatriya's nature is *Rajas,* with *Sattva* subordinate to it; the source of the Vaiśya's nature is *Rajas,* with *Tamas* subordinate to it; the source of the Śūdra's nature is *Tamas,* with *Rajas* subordinate to it; since the innate disposition (*svabhāva*) of the four are (respectively) observed to be tranquillity, lordliness, endeavour, and dullness.

Or (to give yet another interpretation): nature (*svahhāvac*) is the impression (*saṁskāra*) of acts done in past lives, left in the minds of living beings, and manifesting itself, in the present birth as ready to produce its effects; and this (*svabhāva*) being the cause of the *gunas,* they (the *guṇas*) are said to be 'born of nature' (*svabhāva-prabhava*), since the appearance of the *guṇas* is not possible without a cause. By saying that *svabhāva* is the cause, it is meant that it is a kind of specific cause[42].

Thus, in accordance with the *guṇas, Sattva, Raias, and Tamas,* born of nature (*svabhāva*), i.e. born of *Prakṛti,* the duties such as (associated with) tranquillity are distributed, in conformity with their respective tendencies.

41. not having (a second birth through) the investiture with the sacred thread (*upanayana*). (Ā)

42. *Vāsana* i.e. *saṃskāra* (latent impression) is the *nimitta-kārana* (secondary cause) for the manifestation of the *guṇas,* while *Prakṛti* is the *upādhāna-kāraṇa* (material cause). (Ā)

Objection:—Duties such as (associated with) tranquillity etc., are assigned to Brāhmaṇas and the others by the *Sāstra*, i.e. they are prescribed by the *Śāstra*; how can it be said that they are distributed according to the *guṇas*, *Sattva* and the others?

Reply:—There is no room for this objection. Even by the *Śāstra*, the duties such as (associated with) tranquillity are assigned to Brāhmaṇas and others, only with reference to their characteristic *guṇas* such as *Sattva*, and not without regard to the *guṇas*; therefore even though the duties are assigned by the *Sāstra*, they are said to be distributed in accordance with the *guṇas*.

What then are those duties?—That is stated:

शमो दमस्तपः शौचं क्षान्तिरार्जवमेव च ।
ज्ञानं विज्ञानमास्तिक्यं ब्रह्मकर्म स्वभावजम् ॥ ४२ ॥

Śamo damas-tapah śaucam kṣāntir-ārjavam-eva ca
Jñānam vijñānam-āstikyam brahma-karma svabhāvajam

42. Tranquillity, self-restraint, austerity, purity, forbearance, and also uprightness, knowledge, realisation, (religious) faith,—these are the duties of Brāhmaṇas, born of (their own) nature.

Tranquillity and *self-restraint*: these have the meanings already explained[43], *austerity*, of the body etc., already specified[44], *purity*, already explained[45], *forbearance*, forgiveness[46], *and also uprightness*, rectitude[47], *knowledge*, *realisation*, *faith* in the teaching of the Scriptures, belief in a hereafter,—*these are the duties of Brāhmaṇas*, of the Brāhmaṇa caste, *born of their own nature*; this means the same as what has been referred to as "distributed, according to the guṇas, born of nature" (XVIII.41).

43. vide XVI. 1 Rnd 2 Com.
44. vide XVII. 14 to 16 and Com.
45. vide XIII.7 Com Rnd XVI.3 Com.
46. vide XVI.3 Com.
47. vide XIII.7 Com.

शौर्यं तेजो धृतिर्दाक्ष्यं युद्धे चाप्यपलायनम् ।
दानमीश्वरभावश्च क्षात्रं कर्म स्वभावजम् ॥ ४३ ॥

Śauryam tejo dhṛtir-dākṣyam yuddhe cāpyapalāyanam
Dānam-īśvara-bhāvaśca kṣātram karma svabhāvajam

43. Prowess, boldness, fortitude, dexterity, and also not fleeing from battle, generosity, and lordliness, are the duties of Kṣatriyas, born of (their own) nature.

Prowess, the disposition of a hero[48]; *boldness*, strength (of character)[49], *fortitude*, self-command, that disposition of mind upheld by which a man does not get depressed in any situation whatever; *dexterity*, the capacity of an expert, namely the application to duties, which arise all on a sudden before him, without getting embarrassed; *and also not fleeing from battle*, not turning away from foes; *generosity*, free-handedness (liberality) in bestowing gifts; *and lordliness*, the exercise of ruling power over those who are to be governed;—(these) *are the duties of*, prescribed for *Kṣatriyas*, the Kṣatriya caste, *born of* (their own) *nature*.

कृषिगौरक्ष्यवाणिज्यं वैश्यकर्म स्वभावजम् ।
परिचर्यात्मकं कर्म शूद्रस्यापि स्वभावजम् ॥ ४४ ॥

Kṛṣi-gaurakṣya-vāṇijyam vaiśya-karma svabhāvajam
Paricaryātmakam karma śūdrasyāpi svabhāvajam

44. Agriculture, cattle-rearing, and trade are the duties of Vaiśyas, born of (their own) nature; and of the Śūdra, action consisting of service is the duty born of (his own) nature.

48. *Vikrama*, heroism, the propensity to assail even those who are mightier than oneself. (Ā)

49. non-submission to indignity or defeat at the hands of another. (Ā)

Agriculture, ploughing of the ground, *cattle-rearing*, protection of covers, *add trade*, the business of a merchant, consisting in buying and selling (goods), *are the duties of Vaiśyas*, the Vaiśya community, *born of* (their own) *nature.—And, of the Śūdra, action consisting of service*, of the nature of attendance, *is the duty born of* (his own) *nature*.

When these duties prescribed severally for each caste are duly performed, the āttainment of Svarga (heaven) becomes their natural fruit, as stated in the Smṛtis such as the following: "Persons belonging to the several castes (*varṇas*) and orders of life (*āśramas*), each firmly adhering to the practice of the duties prescribed for him, enjoy the fruits of (their) actions after death, and then by the residual (*karma*) attain to births in superior countries, castes, and families, and (possessed of) superior dharma, duration of life, learning, conduct wealth, happiness, and intelligence". (Āp.II. ii.2-3; Gau. XI.29). And, in the Purāṇa also, it is taught that persons of the several castes and orders of life attain to different worlds and results.

But the result which is going to be mentioned is due to a quite different cause[50]:—

स्वे स्वे कर्मण्यभिरतः संसिद्धिं लभते नरः ।
स्वकर्मनिरतः सिद्धिं यथा विन्दति तच्छृणु ॥ ४५ ॥

Sve sve karmaṇyabhirataḥ saṁsiddhiṁ labhate naraḥ
Sva-karma-nirataḥ siddhiṁ yathā vindati tacchṛṇu

45. Devoted each to his own duty, man attains to perfection. How one engaged in his own duty does attain perfection, that hear.

Devoted exclusively *each to his own duty*, differently (for each) as declared, according to his nature, *man*, the person whose duty it is (to practise Karma-Yoga) *attains to perfection*, consisting

50. namely, the performance of the very same duties, for the sake of securing Liberation (*Mokṣa*). (Ā)—and not their specified results.

in the body and the sense-organs becoming qualified for steadfast adherence in the path of Knowledge (jñāna niṣṭha), when all one's impurities have been destroyed by the performance of his prescribed duties.

Is this 'perfection' attained directly by just performing one's prescribed duty[51]? No[52]. How then?

How, by what manner, *one engaged in his own duty, does attain perfection, that hear.*

यतः प्रवृत्तिर्भूतानां येन सर्वमिदं ततम् ।
स्वकर्मणा तमभ्यर्च्य सिद्धिं विन्दति मानवः ॥ ४६ ॥

Yataḥ pravṛttir-bhūtānām yena sarvam-idam tatam
Sva-karmaṇā tam-abhyarcya siddhim vinadti mānavaḥ

46. From Whom is the evolution of (all) beings, by Whom all this is pervaded, worshipping Him with his own duty, a man attains perfection.

From Whom is the evolution of (*all*) *beings*: the word 'pravṛtti' means 'evolution', as also 'activity'; and the 'pravitti' of all living creatures proceeds from Īśvara, the Antaryāmin, the Ruler-within[53]; *by Whom*, Īśvara *all this world is pervaded*; *worshipping* adoring, propitiating, *Him.* Īśvara, *with his* (i.e. one's) *own duty*, as stated above, each according to his caste, *a man attain s perfection*, which consists in merely getting qualified for devotion to the path of Knowledge.

51. Assuming that 'perfection' (*saṁsiddhi*) refers to Mokṣa, the doubt is raised whether the prescription of *saṁnyāsa* etc. as the means to *Mokṣa* is not meaningless, when it could be secured merely by the performance of one's own duty. (Ā)

52. By the mere performance of one's own duty, neither is *Mokṣa* directly attainable, nor even is the competence for *Jñāna-niṣṭha*. (Ā)

53. The 'evolution' of all creatures is from Īśvara; and their 'activity' proceeds from the Antar-yāmin. (Ā)

It being thus, therefore—

श्रेयान्स्वधर्मो विगुणः परधर्मात्स्वनुष्ठितात् ।
स्वभावनियतं कर्म कुर्वन्नाप्नोति किल्बिषम् ॥ ४७ ॥

Śreyān-sva-dharmo viguṇaḥ para-dharmāt-svanuṣṭhitāt
Svabhāva-niyatam karma kurvann-āpnoti kilbiṣam

47. Better is one's own *dharma* (though) destitute of merits[54], than the *dharma* of another well-performed. Doing the duty ordained according to (one's own) nature, one incurs no evil.

Better, more commendable, *is one's own dharma*, even though (—the words 'even though' ("api") are to be understood—) it be *destitute of merits, than the dharma of another well-performed. Doing the duty ordained according to* (one's own) *nature*—this refers to what has already been spoken of as 'born of their own nature, (sva-bhāvāja, in vv. 42 to 44), *one incurs no evil, sin.* Just as to a worm, born in a poisonous substance, that poison does no harm, so also here.

It has been stated that one doing the *dharma* ordained according to his own nature incurs no sin, on the analogy of the worm born in a poisonous substance; that the *dharma* of another is productive of danger (III-35), and that none, bereft of Self-knowledge, can ever rest for even an instant without performing action (III.5). Therefore,

सहजं कर्म कौन्तेय सदोषमपि न त्यजेत् ।
सर्वारम्भा हि दोषेण धूमेनाग्निरिवावृताः ॥ ४८ ॥

54. i.e., *seemingly* destitute of merits. The *svadharmas*, ordained as they are by the *Śāstras* cannot be *really* destitute of merits. But seemingly they may appear so, as when Arjuna found the killing in his *Kṣatriya-dharma* as causative of "great sin". (I.45)

Sahajam karma Kaunteya sadoṣam-api na tyajet
Sarvārambhā hi doṣeṇa dhūmenāgnir-ivāvṛtāḥ

48. The duty born with himself, O son of Kuntī, though attended with evil, one should not relinquish; for, all undertakings are indeed enveloped by evil, as fire by smoke.

The duty born with himself, which has arisen even at his very birth, *O son of Kuntī, though attended with evil,* because it is composed of the three guṇas, *one should not relinquish*[55];

For, all undertakings, i.e. all duties, according to the context;—whatever they may be, whether one's own, or those of another,—all of them *are indeed,* i.e. by reason of being made up of the three guṇas, *enveloped by evil, as fire by the smoke* born with it.

The import is: abandoning the duty born with oneself called *sva-dharma,* even though one might perform the duty of another, he will not be free from evil; and (so) the duty of another is also productive of danger[56]. And, since it is not possible for a man who has not known the Self to abandon action entirely, therefore, he must not renounce (the duty born with himself).

(A detailed discussion of this topic follows.)

The point for consideration is: Is it because of the impossibility of renouncing action entirely that one ought not to renounce (his-own duty), or is it because sin accrues by the abandonment of the duty born with oneself[57]?

Question:—What is the good of this enquiry?

Reply:—If it be that the duty born with oneself ought not to be renounced (merely) because of the impossibility of renouncing

55. A duty which is ordained is not sinful; and it should not be relinquished, though it be attended with evils, as caused by the three *guṇas, Sattva* and the rest, as for example, fighting which involves killing. (Ā)

56. for which reason, it cannot be undertaken. (Ā)

57. sin of *pratyavāya,* which a rises by the failure to perform the obligatory (*nitya*) duty enjoined by Scripture. (Ā)

(action) in its entirety, then it becomes thereby established that by abandoning (action) entirely, only merit can arise.

Objection:—Truly so; but it is not possible to bring about entire renunciation of action.

Reply:—Is the *Puruṣa* (soul) of the nature of eternal motion, like the *guṇas* of the Sāṁkhyas? Or, is action itself the actor[58], like the five *skandhas* of the Bauddhas undergoing destruction every moment? In both cases, entire renunciation of action becomes and impossibility.[59]

And then, there is a third alternative: when doing an act, the being ("vastu" i.e. soul) is with action; when he does not act, then that very same being (soul) is actionless; in this view, it is possible to entirely renounce action. And there is this speciality in this theory, namely: the being (soul) is not ever-mobile; neither is action itself the actor. Then what?—In the permanent substance (soul), action which was (previously) non-existent arises, and action which was existent comes to an end; the substance (soul) always stays pure, possessing potentiality (of activity) and it is itself the agent[60]—thus say the Kāṇādās (i.e., Vaiśeṣikas).

Question:—What is there to find fault with in this theory?

Reply:—This is itself the fault, namely, that it is a theory which contradicts the Lord's doctrine.

Question:—How is this ascertained?

Reply:—Because the Lord has declared: "Of the unreal, there is no existence, etc." (II.16). But, the doctrine of the Kāṇādās is this: that the non-existent comes into being ānd that the existent vanishes; thus it is against the Lord's teaching.

58. i.e. action and actor are identical, and so the soul (agent) is of the nature of activity. The five *skaddhas* are: *rūpa*, *vijñāna*, *vedanā*, *samjñā* and *saṁskāra* (form, consciousness, feeling, organs and mental dispositions respectively. (Ā)

59. Because , in both cases, it will mean the ruin of the very nature of the soul. (Ā)

60. as possessing the potentiality to act. (Ā)

Question:—Even though it is contrary to the Lord's teaching how can it be found fault with if it is compatible with reason?

Reply:—We say (as follows): this theory is faulty, as it is contrary to all evidence (presented to reasoning).

Question:—How?

Reply:—If (as the Kāṇādās say) a substance such a *dvyaṇuka*'' (an aggregate of two atoms) is, prior to its appearance, absolutely non-existent, and if, staying for some time after having been produced, it again merely becomes absolutely non-existent, then in that case, it follows that what is non-existent itself becomes, existent and what is existent gets non-existent; (that is to say) non-being becomes being and being becomes non-being. Here, they assume that a non-existent object which is about to be produced (i.e. to come into being)—which before its manifestation is like a hare s horn—comes into being, on account of the action of the (three-fold) cause—the material (*samavāyi*), the accidental (*asamavāyi*), and the efficient (*nimita*). But (as to this, we say) it cannot be asserted that a non-existent object comes into being in the manner stated, or that it stands in need of a cause; for we do not find it to be so in the case of the hare,s horn and other non-existent objects. If (on the other hand) a pot and the like which are about to be produced are of the nature of entites (i.e. realities), then it is possible to understand that they come into being with the aid of some cause which merely brings about their manifestation.

Moreover, if the non-existent can become the existent, and the existent become the non-existent, then nobody will have faith with respect to the coherence between (the different kinds of) evidence (*pramāṇa*) and the objects ascertainable by evidence (*prameya*) in as much as there will be no certainty that (what was settled to be) an existent will always remain existent and that a non-existent will ever remain non-existent.

Besides, when they (the Kāṇādās) say that something is produced, they speak of the substance such as the "*dvyaṇuka*" as connected with its cause and with reality (existence). Having indeed been non-existent before its production it subsequently

becomes—through the functioning of its cause—united with that cause, namely the ultimate atoms (*paramāṇus*) and with reality (existence), by the relation spoken of as *samavāya* (inseparable inherence); and becoming so connected, i.e. intimately united with the cause, it becomes existent. With regard to this (theory of theirs), they have to explain how for a non-existent thing there can be a cause (that is existent) or a connection with anything whatever. Indeed, it is impossible to imagine, in the case of a barren woman's son, (his) existence, or connection with anything, or a cause, through any kind of evidence.

Objection:—The Vaiśeṣikas do not hold that it is the non-existent (unreal) that is related (to a cause or wtth anything); they speak of existent objects alone, substances such as the '*dvyaṇu-kas*'', as related to their causes through *samavāya* (inseparable inherence).

Reply:—It is not so; for they are not taken as existent prior to this (kind of) relation. Indeed, the Vaiśeṣikas do not hold that objects such as a pot exist prior to the operation of the potter, the potter's stick, and wheel, etc. Nor do they hold that forms such as the pot are produced solely from clay. From this, as the remaining alternative, they have to assent to the relationship of a non-existent (pot etc., to its cause;—which is unsustainable).

Objection:—It will not be improper to hold that even the non-existent can be related by *samavāya* (to its cause).

Reply:—Not so; for, it is not seen in the case of the barren woman's son etc. If, only with respect to the antecedent non-existence (*prāgabhāva*) of the pot and the like, there is connection with their own cause, but not in the case of the barren woman's son and the like,—even though both (classes) are equally non-existent,—it needs to be explained how such a distinction can be made. Non-existence of one, non-existence of two, non-existence of everything, antecedent non-existence, non-existence after destruction (*pradhvamsābhāva*), mutual non-existence (*itara-itarābhāva*- absolute non-existence (*atyantābhāva*)—nobody can specifically show any distinction among these. And in the absence of any distinction, to hold that only the antecedent non-existence of the pot attains the form of a pot through (the operation of) the potter

etc., that it also becomes related to the entity known as the potsherds[61] which form its (material) cause, and that it becomes fit for all purposes[62]; but that such is not the case with respect to the non-existence after destruction of the pot itself, even though there is non-existence (common to both), is unintelligible. It is also improper to hold that the (other) non-existences, such as non-existence after destruction, can nowhere become the objects of any proceeding[63], whereas antecedent non-existence alone, of substances such as "*dvyaṇukas*", can become the object of proceedings such as becoming produced, and so on, since this (antecedent non-existence) is euqally a non-entity, just as absolute non-existence and non-existence after destruction are.

Objection:—We do not say that antecedent non-existence becomes the existent.

Reply:—Then, it is only the existent that changes into the existent) That is: a pot becomes (takes the form of) a pot, and a cloth becomes a cloth! Even this is against all evidence, just as the theory that the non-existent becomes existent.

Even the *Pariṇāma* (Trnasformation) theory of the Sāṁkhyas (also known as Sat-Kārya-vāda) is not distinguishable from the theory of the Vaiśeṣikas, inasmuch as it accepts the production and destruction of an effect with its peculiar qualities[64]. And, as for accepting (their explanation through) manifestation and disappearance, we find that these are equally opposed to evidence,

61. '*kapāla*', referring to the parts of clay which form the (material) cause of the pot. (Ā)

62. all purposes, dependent on the pot, such as its production, destruction, etc. (Ā)

63. such as production, etc. (Ā)

64. *dharma—pariṇāma* (modification or effect) (Ā); '*dharma*' also means 'peculiar qualities'.

as was the former (Vaiśeṣika) theory, when we investigate whether they are cognisable or non-cognisable (existent or non-existent)[65].

From what has been stated, the theory, that production etc. (of an effect) is simply another state of the cause itself, also stands refuted.

As the only remaining alternative, there is this doctrine: "Existence, one only, the Reality, is through *avidyā* mistaken variously, as taking on different forms, with attributes such as production, destruction (being produced, getting destroyed), etc., like a stage-actor", which has been stated by the Lord in the verse, "For the unreal, there is no existence" (II.16); the experience (cognition) of the existent ('*sat*') being permanent, and that of all the rest being transitory.

Question:—The Self being immutable, how then can it be impossible to renounce action entirey?

65. According to the *Sāṁkhya* theory also, when the new modification (effect) which was non-existent is produced, the previous modification (cause) which was existent disappears. This is contrary to the principle (upheld by the Lord) that the non-existent is ever the non-existent and that the existent is ever existent (II.16).

Here, the Sāṁkhya sais: The effect, potentially existing (i.e. lRtent) in the cause is a real entity (existent) though un-manifested; and becomes manifested through the causal operation (*kāraka-vyāpāra*). Thus, there is only the production of manifestation and the disappearance of non-manifestation. Accordingly, this is distinguishable from the Vaiśeṣika theory, since there is no new creation.

(The vedntin asks:) Is manifestation existent prior to the casual operation, just as non-manifestation; or is it not?—If it is pre-existent, there is futility of the causal operation, and hence no warrant for assuming it. If it is not pre-existent, it could-never be brought about by any means whatsoever—and you abandon your theory of "*Sat-kāryā-vada*" (viz., causation is the manifestation of what is in a latent condition in the cause).

Again after the causal operation, does the (prior) non-manifestation (continue to) exist, as does manifestation or does it not? If the former, the same fault arises (abandonment of your theory); and if non-manifestation does not (continue to) exist, since an existent becoming non-existent is unacceptable, there will be utter lack of truth in the validity of the means of proof (*māna*) and the object ascertainable (*meya*). (Ā)

Reply:—Whether the *guṇas*[66] are realities or whether they are fashioned by *avidyā*, action is an attribute of the *guṇas*. Then, since it is ascribed to the Self, precisely through *avidyā*, it has been stated that the man ignorant of the (truth about the) Self cannot indeed renounce action entirely, even for a moment (III.5). On the contrary, the knower of (the truth about the) Self is capable of renouncing action entirely, because *avidyā* has been dispelled by *vidyā* (Knowledge) and there is no possibility of any residue remaining of what had been ascribed through *avidyā*. Verily, no resideu is left staying of the dual moon etc. falsely raised through the eye-sight affected by *timira*, on the removal of the *timira*, Such being the case, the following statements (of the Lord) are quite appropriate:

"Having renounced all actions by the mind..." (V.13), etc.; as also (by way of contrast), "Devoted each to his own duty, man attains to perfection" (XVIII. 45); and, "Worshipping Him with his own duty, a man attains perfection" (XVIII. 46).

It has been stated that the perfection arising from (the performance of) action consists in becoming qualified for devotion to the path of Knowledge. Seeing that th fruit thereof, namely, the perfection consisting in absolute freedom from action (*naiṣkarmya-siddhi*), known as *jñānaniṣṭhā*, should be told, the Lord proceeds to (teach it in) this verse;

असक्तबुद्धिः सर्वत्र जितात्मा विगतस्पृहः ।
नैष्कर्म्यसिद्धिं परमां संन्यासेनाधिगच्छति ॥ ४९ ॥

Asakta-buddhiḥ sarvatra jitātmā vigata-spṛhaḥ
Naiṣkarmya siddhim paramām saṁnyāsenā-
dhigacchati

49. He whose intellect is not attached anywhere, whose self is subdued,whose desires have fled,—he, by renunciation, attains to the supreme perfection, consisting of freedom from action.

66. Constituting causes and effects. (A)

He whose intellect (buddhi), i.e. the inner sense (antaḥ-karaṇa), *is not attached anywhere*, is free from attachment to sons, wife, and others, that are causes for attachment; *whose self*, inner sense (antaḥ-karaṇa) *is subdued*, brought under control; *whose desires*, yearning for body, for life, and for pleasures, *have fled*; *he* who is of this description, the knower of the Self, *by renunciation* (saṁnyāsa), by Right (Plenary) Knowledge, or by the renunciation of all actions for which he is prepared by his Right Knowledge, *attains to the supreme perfection, consisting of freedom from action*: On account of his perfect knowledge of the actionless Brahman-Ātman—(i.e. their identity), all actions have fled from him, and he is a person without action; and this state of his is 'freedom from action' (naiṣkarmya), and it is itself 'perfection' (siddhi)—

Or, 'naiṣkarmya-siddhi' can be interpreted as the 'siddhi', attainment, of 'naiṣkarmya', actionlessness, the state in which he remains as the actionless Self. That state is supreme, different from any perfection resulting from (the performance of some) action; it is the state of immediate liberation (*sadyo-mukti*). And, this, the Lord, has already stated: "Having renounced all actions by the mind......rests......without at all acting or causing to act" (V. 13).

In the case of him who has attained to the perfection of the nature previously stated (XVIII.46) through the performance of his appropriate duty as described above as an act of worship to the Lord (XVIII. 42 to 46), and who has acquired the discriminative knowledge concerning the Self, the manner in which the (supreme) perfection known as 'freedom from action' (*naiṣkarmya*), consisting in fixity in the knowledge of the pure Self, is reached, has to be explained. This, the Lord proceeds to do.

सिद्धिं प्राप्तो यथा ब्रह्म तथाऽऽप्नोति निबोध मे ।
समासेनैव कौन्तेय निष्ठा ज्ञानस्य या परा ।। ५० ।।

Siddhim prāpto yathā Brahma tathā(ā)pnoti nibodha me
Samāsenaiva Kaunteya niṣṭha jñānasya yā parā

50. How he, who has reached (such) perfection, attains to Brahman, that in brief, O son of Kuntī, learn from Me—that (which is the) supreme consummation of Knowledge.

How he, who has reached (such) *perfection*, consisting in his body and sense-organs becoming qualified for devotion to the path of Knowledge, through the Grace of the Lord Whom he has worshipped by performing his prescribed duty:—

The repetition of the words referring to the 'perfection reached' is for introducing what follows. What the sequel is to which the repetition is intended to lead is (now) stated—

How, by what method, he *attains to Brahman*, the Supreme Self (Paramātman) namely the path of jñāna-niṣṭha (devotion to Knowledge), *that* method, the procedure for attainment of jñāna-nistha, do you *learn from Me*, understand with certainty, from My words.

Will it be described extensively? No, says the Lord; *in brief*, conscisely alone, *O son of KuntI.*

The attainment of Brahman, which has been avouched in the words, 'how he attains to Brahman, that learn', the Lord proceeds to describe as of this description, namely, *that* it is the *supreme consummation of Knowledge.* (Here) "Niṣṭha" (consummation) means perfection, the termination, the final stage.—

Question:—(Consummation) of what?

Reply:—It is the supreme consummation of Brahma-jñāna (Knowledge of Brahman).

Question:—Of what nature is it.[67]

67. The questioner implies that the supreme consummation of *Brahma-jñāna* is not generally known to everybody and that it needs to be brought about by the employment of special means. (Ā) See next note.

Reply:—Of the same nature as *Ātma-jñāna* (knowledge of the Self).[68]

Question:—Of what nature is that?[69]

Reply:—Of the same nature as the Self.

Question:—Of what nature is the Self?[70]

Reply:—Of the nature described by the Lord, and in the passages of the *Upaniṣads* and (settled) by Nyāya (reasoning)[71].

Objection:—Knowledge (*jñāna*), cognition, is of the form of an object; but it is nowhere admitted that the Self is an object (of cognition) or that it has a form.

Reply:—It is stated in *Śruti* that the Self is with form, in the passages,' 'Of the colour of the sun' (*Śv*.III.8), 'Of the form of luminosity' (*Ch*.III.xiv.2), 'Self-luminous' (*Bṛ*.IV.iii. 9).

Objection:—No; those passages are intended (simply) to deny that the Self is of the form of darkness (*tamas*). Since it is denied in the case of the Self that it is of the form of a substance (*dravya*) or an attribute (*guṇa*), it would follow that it is of the form of darkness (*tamas*); and the negation of such an inference is the purpose of the passages such as, 'Of the colour of the sun'. Besides, form is especially denied (for the Self) by the description ('formless' (Ka.I.iii.15); and it cannot be an object of cognition, as declared in passages such as, "His form is not within the range of sight; not by the eye does any one see it" (*Ka.II*.vi. 9, *Śv*. 2'0), "devoid of

68. The reply shows that it can be easily known, since it follows *Atma-jnana*, which is well-understood. (A). Though Brahman and Atman are the same Truth Absolute, the term "Brahman" signifying the vastness of the Basis of all appearances makes it incomprehensible; whereas "Atman", signifying one's own Self appears intimately near at hand.

69. expressing the doubt that even that is not well-defined. (Ā)

70. This question arises because the self is variously understood, causing confusion. (Ā)

71. The Lord has defined the nature of the Self in such passages as II. 20; and reasoning shows the Self to be immutable (*kūṭastha*) and unattached (*asaṅga*). (Ā)

sound, devoid of touch" (*Ka*.I.iii.15). Therefore, it is not right to speak of a cognition of 'the form' of the Sel. How then can there be any cognition of the Self? All cognition indeed, to whatever object it relates, takes the form of that (specific) object. And it has been stated that the Self has no form. When both the cognition (of the Self) and the Self are formless, how can there be the constant contemplation of Self-knowledge, or its consummation?

Reply:—What you say is not correct. It can be demonstrated through reasoning that the Self is absolutely stainless (pure), clear, and subtle; and that *buddhi* (intellect) can be as stainless, clear and subtle as the Self and can bear the reflection (semblance, *ābhāsa*) of that aspect of the Self which manifests as consciousness (*caitanya*). The mind (*manas*) puts on the reflection (semblance) of *buddhi*; the sense-organs put on a semblance of the mind; and the body puts on a semblance of the sense-organs; and consequently ordinary people view the physical body alone as the self.

And Lokāyatikas (materialists) who hold the doctrine that the body possesses consciousness declare that the *Puruṣa* (man) is (only) the physical body endowed with consciousness. Similarly, there are others who declare that the senses possess consciousness; yet others declare that the mind is consciousness; and, others, again, who declare that the *buddhi* is consciousness. There are again some who understand what is even inside that (*buddhi*)—namely the *Avyakta* (the Un-manifested), called *Avyākṛta* (the Un-differentiated), abiding as *Avidyā*,—to be the Self[72]. Indeed, in everything from buddhi down to the body, the reflection (semblance) of the Consciousness of the Self (in that) is the cause of the wrong notion that it is the Self.

Wherefore, it is unnecessary to enjoin (the acquisition of) the knowledge about the Self. What then (is to be done)? What needs to be done is simply the removal of the superimposition (on the Self) of the 'not-Self', such as name, form, etc. It is not necessary to take any steps to acquire the knowledge of the Consciousness-Seflf, since it is grasped distinctively in (association with)

72. Those who worship, contemplate the Cause (of the Universe) consider the *Antaryāmin*, the *Avyakṛta* endued with consciousness, to be the Ātman. (Ā)

the forms of all objects (*buddhi* etc.) superimposed by *avidyā*. Accordingly, indeed, the Vijñānavādin Buddhists, hold that there are no existent objects (*vastu*) apart from cognition (*vijñāna*) and that no external evidence is necessary (to prove the existence of *vijñāna*), since it is admittedly self-cognised. Therefore, what needs to be done is merely the rejection of what is erroneously attributed to Brahman through *avidyā*, and not any effort to acquire a knowledge of Brahman, as He is intimately well-known.

Though Brahman is extremely well-known, easily grasped, very near, and is the very Self, He appears to the un-enlightened as unknown, difficult to grasp, and very far, and as if He were different (from themselves), because their *budhi* (reason) has been carried away by the differentia of names and forms invented by *āvidyā*. On the other hand, for those who have turned their *buddhi* away from external forms, who have secured the grace of the Guru and serenity (propitiousness) of the mind (ātmā), there is nothing else more blissful, more well-known, more easily grasped, and more intimate (than Brahman). And this has been stated by the Lord) thus: "directly comprehensible, endowed with merit, etc." (IX.2).

Some pedants, fancying themselves to be learned, say that, since the reality that is the Self is without form, *buddhi* cannot grasp the Self, and consequently devotion to Right Knowledge is impossible of attainment. Truly so, for those who have not had the benefit of the traditional instruction through the Guru, who have not understood the Vedāntas (the final teachings of the Vedas in the Upaniṣads), whose *buddhi* (intellect) is extremely addicted to external objects, and who have not made any effort to resort to the right means of getting (true) knowledge[73]. But to those who are the opposite (i.e. have had the traditional instruction through the Guru, etc.), it is wholly impossible to believe in the reality of the differentiated obiects of common experience, consisting of the perceived and the perceiver, since they cannot comprehend anything other than the Consciousness-Self (*ātma-caitanya*) as real. And we have stated (previously) that this is exactly the truth, and not the contrary. And the Lord has expressed the

73. Each preceding attribute is to be understood as the cause of the succeeding one. (Ā)

same in the verse, "That in which all beings are awake, that is night for the Muni who sees" (II.69).

Therefore, it is only the disappearance of the belief in dualism resting on external forms (appearances) that can bring about the abidance in the true nature of the Self. Indeed, the Self is not a thing which is unknown to anybody at any time; it is not an object to be attained, or abandoned, or acquired. If indeed the Self be (absolutely) known, it would follow that all activities have no end or aim in themselves[74]. And it is not possible to imagine that they are for the sake of the physical body etc. which are inanimate (have no consciousness); nor that happiness is (sought after merely) for the sake of happiness or that pain is (suffered merely) for the sake of pain.—For, all proceedings (activities) are intended to culminate in the realisation of the Self[75]. Wherefore it is concluded that just as no external evidence is needed for discerning (the existence of) one's own body, there is no need for any external evidence for comprehending what is more near, namely the Self, who is most intimate, and that devotion to Self-Knowledge is very familiar to those who possess the faculty of discrimination.

Even those who hold the view that knowledge (jñāna, cognition) being without form cannot be directly perceived, must admit that, since the comprehension of any object of knowledge is dependent on cognition, cognition is perfectly well-known, in exactly the same manner as happiness and the like.

Also, (with respect to cognition) there can be no question of 'seeking to know' it. If cognition were (in fact) unknown, it should be sought to be known as any other object of cognition; just as for instance a knower desires to comprehend through cognition an object of cognition such as a pot, so also should he seek to

74. Since all actions intended for securing prosperity or final beatitude cannot, in the absence of the person who desires them, be related to oneself, their purposefulness becomes baseless. (Ā)

75. It is thus established that there is a person who desires the fruits of his activities, and that all activities (enjoined by *Śruti*) such as *yajña* are intended as a means to Self-knowledge, as settled by reasoning (*Br.Sū.*III.iv.26-27). (Ā)

comprehend even cognition itself through another cognition; but this is not what happens.

So we conclude that cognition is perfectly well-known (to every one); and that the cogniser also is thereby well-known. Consequently, effort need not be madefor (securing) knowledge (of the Self or Brahman)[76], but it (effort) is necessary only for getting rid of the conception of the not-Self as the Self. Therefore, devotion to the path of knowledge (*jñāna-niṣṭhā*) is quite feasible of attainment.

How this supreme consummation of Knowledge[77] is attained is now stated:

बुद्ध्या विशुद्धया युक्तो धृत्याऽऽत्मानं नियम्य च ।
शब्दादीन्विषयांस्त्यक्त्वा रागद्वेषौ व्युदस्य च ॥ ५१ ॥

Buddhyā viśuddhayā yukto dhṛtyā(ā)tmānam niyamya ca
Śabdādīn-viṣayāṁs-tyaktvā rāga dveṣau vyudasya ca

51. Endued with a pure intellect, subduing himself with fortitude, relinquishing sense-objects such as sound, casting off attachment and hatred;

(The sentence is completed in verse 53).

Endued With a pure intellect possessed of the determination[78] free from Māyā (illusion)[79], *subduing*, keeping under control, *himself*, the aggregate of the body and the senses, *with fortitude,*

76. Since knowledge (cognition) is ever present, there is no injunction (*vidhi*) with respect to it, such as is prescribed for bringing about manifestation (of something that is not present). (Ā)

77. The supreme culmination of the *Knowledge* of Brahman; the culmination in Brahman through the abolition of all attributes not pertaining to Him but ascribed to Him falsely, and consisting in the continuous flow of the awareness of Brahman. (Ā)

78. The certainly of the identity of Brahman and the Ātman. (Ā)

79. i.e. utterly devoid of doubt and misconception. (Ā)

self-command; *relinquishing sense-objects such as sound*—from the context, this means, abandoning all superflous happiness, all objects except those alone which are necessary for the bare sustenance of the body); *casting off*, abandoning, *attachment and hatred* even for those objects which may be met with as needed for the maintenance of the body;

Thereafter,

विविक्तसेवी लघ्वाशी यतवाक्कायमानसः ।
ध्यानयोगपरो नित्यं वैराग्यं समुपाश्रितः ॥ ५२ ॥

Vivikta-sevī laghvāśī yata-vāk-kāya-mānasaḥ
Dhyāna-yoga-paro nityam vairāgyam samupāśritaḥ

52. Resorting to a sequestered spot; eating but little; speech, body, and mind controlled; ever engaged in meditation and concentration; possessed of dispassion;

Resorting in a sequestered spot always betaking himself to such solitary places as a forest, sand-bank of a river, a mountain-cave; *eating but little*, habituated to a moderate diet;—these two are mentioned as conducive to serenity of mind by warding off evils such as sleep[80];

Speech, body, and mind controlled: the ascetic-devotee of the path of Knowledge must restrain his speech, body, and mind; so, with his senses calmed; *ever engaged in meditation*, always having it as his supreme business to engage in the contemplation of the natural state of the Self, *and concentration* (of the mind), with one-pointedness, on the Self alone;—the word 'ever' ("nityam") is for the purpose of declaring that there is nothing else for him to

80. The former conduces to one-pointed composure of mind, while moderation in diet wards off evils such as sleep, indolence, and mis-comprehension. which distract the intellect. (Ā)

engage in, such[81] as mantra-japa (repetition of formula sacred to any deity); *possessed of dispassion*, freedom from desire for objects seen and unseen, which he should always thoroughly betake himself to;

And besides,

अहङ्कारं बलं दर्पं कामं क्रोधं परिग्रहम् ।
विमुच्य निर्ममः शान्तो ब्रह्मभूयाय कल्पते ॥ ५३ ॥

Ahaṁkāram balam darpam kāmam krodham parigraham
Vimucya nirmamaḥ śānto Brahma-bhūyaya kalpate

53. Forsaking egotism, power, arrogance, lust, wrath, and property, freed from the notion of 'mine', and tranquil, he is fit for becoming Brahman.

Forsaking, abandoning, *egotism*, identification of self with (i.e. entertainment of the idea of 'I' with respect to) the body, senses, etc.; *power*, the capacity which is associated with passion and desire, and not any other strength such as that of the body, which being natural is impossible of being abandoned; *arrogance* which comes close upon exultation and leads to the transgression of virtue (dharma), as stated in the Smṛti: "When a man exults, he becomes arrogant; and when he becomes arrogant, he transgresses dharma" (Āp. I. 13.4); *lust*, desire, *wrath*, repugnance, *and property*; though having relinquished all the passions of the senses and the mind, he may get some external belonging, necessary for bodily sustenance and for the observance of his religious duties (dharma); these also he abandons; he becomes a Paramahamsa-Parivrājaka (a saṁnyāsin of the fourth or the highest order[82]); *freed from the notion of 'mine'*, not regarding even the bodily life

81. referring to circumambulation (*pradakṣiṇa*), prostration (*praṇāma*), etc., which are impediments to *Dhyāna-yoga*. (Ā)

82. The other three orders are *Kuṭīcaka*, *Bahūdaka*, and *Haṁsa*.

as his; *and*, because of this[83], *tranquil*, peaceful,—*he*, who is of this nature, having destroyed all (trade of) exultation and care, the ascetic devoted to the path of Knowledge, *is fit*, qualifies, *for becoming Brahman.*

In this manner,

ब्रह्मभूतः प्रसन्नात्मा न शोचति न काङ्क्षति ।
समः सर्वेषु भूतेषु मद्भक्तिं लभते पराम् ॥ ५४ ॥

Brahmabhūtaḥ prasannātma na śocati na kāṁkṣati
Samaḥ sarveṣu bhūtesu mad-bhaktim labhate parām

54. Brahman-become, (and) of serene self,he neither grieves nor desires; the same to all beings, he attains to supreme devotion unto Me.

Brahman-become, having reached Brahman[84], and *of serene self*, having attained the tranquillity of the Self[85], *he neither grieves*, feels distressed about any deficiency in material possessions or any lack of excellence in himself, *nor desires.*

The statement, "he neither grieves nor desires" is a mere reference to what is the natural condition of the person who has become Brahman, for it is indeed not proper to associate the desire for any unattained object with the knower of Brahman.

Another reading is "he neither grieves nor exults (na hṛṣyati)" (i.e. "hṛṣyati" instead of "kāṁkṣati").

The same to all beings, that is, he looks upon the pleasure and the pain of all beings by the same standard as for himself (VI.32); the perception of the One Self, the same in all, is not meant

83. i.e. the absence of the ideas of 'I' (*Ahaṁkāra*) and 'mine' (*mamakāra*). (A)

84. Even while alive, he is freed from all evils and enjoys the unexcelled bliss, namely Brahman, as being his very Self. (Ā)

85. *adhyātma-prasāda*: the manifestation of the supreme bliss, through the removal of all evil, in the individual self. (Ā)

here, as it is being stated (in the next verse) in the words, "By devotion he knows Me. XVIII. 55)";

he, the devotee in the path of Knowledge, of this nature, *attains to supreme devotion*, the highest and the fourth kind of devotion, designated as Knowledge, unto Me, the Parameśvara (the Supreme Lord)[86], which has been referred to in the verse, "Four kinds of virtuous men worship Me" (VII. 16).

Thereupon,

भक्त्या मामभिजानाति यावान्यश्चास्मि तत्त्वतः ।
ततो मां तत्त्वतो ज्ञात्वा विशते तदनन्तरम् ॥ ५५ ॥

Bhaktyā mām-abhijānāti yāvān-yaścāsmi tattvatah
Tato mam tattvato jñātva viśate tad-anantaram

55. By devotion, he knows Me in reality, what and who I am; then having known Me in reality, he forthwith enters into Me.

By the *devotion* termed Knowledge, *he knows Me in reality what* I am, that I am Myself the vast multiplicity caused by the upādhis (limiting adjuncts), *and who I am*, that I am in truth devoid of all the multiplicity caused by the upadhis, that I am the Supreme Person, that I am like the ākāśa; he knows Me to be the non-dula, Consciousness Absolute—the One essence, Unborn, Un-decaying, Un-dying, Fearless, Deathless. *Then, having* thus *known Me in reality, he forthwith enters into Me*, Myself, immediately on attaining Knowledge.

Here, it is not meant that the act of knowing and the act of entering forthwith are two separate acts, as denoted by the terms 'knowing' and 'entering forthwith'. What then is meant[87]? It is

86. For that person who is freed while yet living (*jīvan-mukta*), devotion to Knowledge which has been attained in the manner stated becomes well-established, and direct knowledge of the identity of the Brahman-Ātman, whose fruit is final emancipation (*mokṣa*), is gained.—(Ā)

87. i.e., by the act of entering.

simply Knowledge itself, for which there is no other result, as has been declared[88] (by the Lord), "Me do you, also, know to be the Kṣetrajña. (XIII.2).

Objection:—Is this not indeed contradictory, to say that "he knows Me" by "the supreme consummation of Knowledge"? As to how this is contradictory, it is thus: When the knowledge of a particular object arises in the knower, at that moment itself the knower knows that object; and *jñāna-niṣṭhā* (devotion to or consummation of Knowledge), which implies repetition of the knowledge, is not necessary. Therefore, the contradiction lies in saying (by implication) that he does not know (Me) by Knowledge, but only by 'devotion to' Knowledge, that is, by the repetition of (the act of) knowledge.

Reply:—The objection does not hold here; for the word '*niṣṭhā*' (devotion, consummation) denotes what knowledge,—endowed with all the causes conducive to its production and to its fruition, and devoid of impediments,—culminates in, namely, the assured state of Self-Awareness (direct experience of the Self, *ātmānubhava*). By the teaching of the Scriptures (Śāstra) and the Master (Ācārya), and with the aid of co-operative causes which bring about the rise and the fruition of knowledge, namely, the purity of the intellect (*buddhi*) etc. (XVIII. 51-53) and the attributes of humility and the rest (XIII. 7 to 11), Knowledge of the identity of the individual Self (Kṣetrajña) and the Supreme Self (Paramātman) is produced; this Knowledge, accompanied with complete renunciation of all action which is bound with the perception of diversity such as agency and other factors of action, finally stays in the assured form of the direct expereience of one's own Self (*Svātmānubhava*); and it is this (culmination) which is spoken of as the supreme consummation of Knowledge. It is the *jñāna-niṣṭh*ā (abidance in Knowledge) which has been mentioned as the supreme, the fourth, kind of devotion (*bhakti*; VII. 17), with reference to the (other) there kinds of devotion, that of the distressed

88. Lest it be doubted that there is some other result, namely (entering, i.e.) the attainment of Brahman, the Lord's declaration is quoted as authority for the non-difference (identity) of Brahman and the Self from which it follows that the attainment of (i.e. entrance into) Brahman is not different from Knowledge. (Ā)

devotee etc. (VII. 16). Through that supreme devotion, he (the jñāni-devotee) knows the Lord as He is; and immediately thereon the perception of difference between the Lord (Īśvara) and the individual Self (Kṣetrajña) is abolished entirely. Wherefore, there is no contradiction in the statement, "he knows Me by the *bhakti* of the form of devotion to Knowledge."

In such a case alone can all the Scriptures—the Vedāntas (Upaniṣads), Itihāsas, Purāṇas and Smṛtis—which prescribe retirement (from activity, worldly life) become meaningful. The scriptural texts are:

"Having known (It), they renounce and lead a life of mendicancy" (*Bṛ*. III. v.i.).

"Therefore they say that renunciation is surpassing among austerities." *Mahā Nā*—11. 79).

"Renunciation excels" (*Mahā, Nā.*—II.79);

"Renunciation of actions is Saṁnyāsa" (XVIII. 2);

"Abandoning the Vedas, this workd and the next" (*Āp*. II. 23.13);

"Renounce dharma and adharma" (*M.B.—Śānti*, 329-40); 331-44) and so on.

Here (In the *Gītās*) also, there are several statements enjoining *saṁnyāsa*[89]. It is not proper to imagine that these passages are meaningless; nor can they be deemed to be of the nature of "*artha-vāda*"[90], since occur in the sections which deal with that particular topic (*saṁnyāsa*).

Also, because *Mokṣa* connotes abidance in the natural immutable state of the Self within[91]. It is indeed not appropriate

89. such as V. 13. (Ā)

90. explanatory statement—as opposed to *vidhi*, (a precept enjoining something)—whose meaning is not to be taken literally.

91. It follows that the seeker of liberation who is devoted to (the path of) Knowledge, which is the means to Mokṣa, has to resort to *saṁnyāsa*, and not follow the path of works.—(Ā)

for one who wishes to reach the eastern sea to take the same road as the man who wishes to reach the western sea, i.e. to proceed in the opposite direction. And devotion to Knowledge (*jñāna-niṣṭhā*) signifies the determined persistence to establish the continued Awareness of the Inner Self, the association of which with action is as incompatible as (the one wishing to reach the eastern sea) going towards the western sea. That the disparity between the two is as (wide as) that between a mountain and a grain of mustard is the positive conclusion of those who know the modes of proof (i.e. of philosophers)[92]. Thus it stands established that the devotion of Knowledge (*jñāna-niṣṭha*) is to be practised by renouncing all action.

The fruit of *Bhakti-yoga*, which is the worship of the Lord through one's appropriate *karma* (duty), is the attainment of the perfection which consists in becoming qualified for the devotion of Knowledge, which, brought about by the former (*Bhakti-Yoga*), terminates in *Mokṣa* (liberation). This Yoga of Devotion to the Lord is now praised, in the section which sums up the teaching of the (*Gītā*) *Śāstra*, with a view to confirming what has been settled as the teaching of the Śāstra.

सर्वकर्माण्यपि सदा कुर्वाणो मद्व्यपाश्रयः ।
मत्प्रसादादवाप्नोति शाश्वतं पदमव्ययम् ॥ ५६ ॥

Sarva-karmānyapi sadā kurvāṇo mad-vyapāśrayaḥ
Mat-prasādād-avāpnoti śāsvatam padam-avyayam

56. Even doing all actions always, taking refuge in Me,—he attains to the eternal, immutable state by My Grace.

Even doing, engaging in, *all actions always*, though they may be prohibited actions as well, *taking refuge in Me*, Vāsudeva, the Lord (Īşvara); that is, with this entire self offered to Me, *he*. that

92. since it is established by *Śruti* and *Smṛti* that all action is abolished by Knowledge, and they both cannot co-exist in the same person. (Ā)

man, *attains to the eternal*, ever-lasting, *immutable state* of Viṣṇu *by My Grace*, the Grace of the Lord[93].

Wherefore thus, therefore—

चेतसा सर्वकर्माणि मयि संन्यस्य मत्परः ।
बुद्धियोगमुपाश्रित्य मच्चित्तः सततं भव ॥ ५७ ॥

Cetasā sarva-karmāṇi mayi saṁnyasya mat-paraḥ
Buddhi-yogam-upāśṛtya mac-cittaḥ satatam bhava

57. Resigning mentally all deeds in Me, regarding Me as the Supreme, resorting to *Buddhi-Yoga*, become mind-absorbed in Me ever.

Resigning mentally, through discriminative understanding[94] *all deeds*, productive of seen and unseen results, *in Me*, the Īśvara, in the manner stated in the verse, "Whatever you do, whatever you eat, etc. (IX. 27); *regarding Me*, Vāsudeva, *as the Supreme*, the highest goal, with your entire self offered to Me; *resorting to Buddhi-Yoga*, having recourse to Buddhi-Yoga, i.e. concentration of mind on Me, as your sole refuge, *become ever*, always, *mind-absorbed in Me* exclusively.

मच्चित्तः सर्वदुर्गाणि मत्प्रसादात्तरिष्यसि ।
अथ चेत्त्वमहंकारान्न श्रोष्यसि विनङ्क्ष्यसि ॥ ५८ ॥

Mac-cittah sarva-durgāṇi mat-prasādāt-tariṣyasi
Atha cet-tvam-ahaṁkārān-na śroṣyasi vinaṁkṣyasi

58. Fixing your mind on Me, you shall, by My Grace, overcome all difficulties; but if, from self-conceit, you will not hear (Me), you shall perish.

93. i.e. the dawn of Right Knowledge. (Ā)

94. that liberation is possible only through the Plenary Wisdom obtainable by the Lord's Grace, and not merely (by the performance of) works. (Ā)

Fixing your mind od Me, you shall, by My Grace, overcome, cross over, *all difficulties*, which are insuperable and constitute the cause of saṁsāra; *but if, from self-conceit*, the egotism that "I am a learned man", *you will not hear* Me, accept My advice, then *you shall perish*, go to ruin.

You should not also entertain this thought: "I am independent, why should I carry out what another says?"—

यदहंकारमाश्रित्य न योत्स्य इति मन्यसे ।
मिथ्यैष व्यवसायस्ते प्रकृतिस्त्वां नियोक्ष्यति ॥ ५९ ॥

Yad-ahaṁkāram-āśritya na yotsya iti manyase
Mithyaiṣa vyavāsāyas-te prakṛtis-tvām niyokṣyati

59. If, betaking (yourself) to egotism, you think, "I will not fight", vain is this your resolve; Prakrti will constrain you.

If, moreover, *betaking* yourself *to egotism, you think*, form the resolve, "*I will not fight*", "I will not engage in battle", *vain is this your resolve*; because ,*Prakṛti* (your) nature as a Kṣatriya, *will constrain you* (to fight).

Also because,

स्वभावजेन कौन्तेय निबद्धः स्वेन कर्मणा ।
कर्तुं नेच्छसि यन्मोहात्करिष्यस्यवशोऽपि तत् ॥ ६० ॥

Svabhāvajena Kaunteya nibaddhaḥ svena karmaṇā
Kartum necchasi yan-mohāt-kariṣyasyavaśo(a)pi tat

60. Fettered, O son of Kuntī, by your own *karma*, born of your own nature, what you, from delusion, desire not to do, that you shall have to do even in spite of yourself.

Fettered, definitely bound, *O son of Kunti, by your own karma*, duty, *born of your own nature*, namely prowess and the rest, pre-

viously specified (XVIII.43), *what* act *you, from delusion*, lack of judgment ("aviveka"), *desire not to do, that* act, *you shall have to do, even in spite of yourself*, being quite under control (of external forces).

For,

ईश्वरः सर्वभूतानां हृद्देशेऽर्जुन तिष्ठति ।
भ्रामयन्सर्वभूतानि यन्त्रारूढानि मायया ॥ ६१ ॥

Iśvaraḥ sarva-bhūtānām hṛd-deśe(A)rjuna tiṣṭhati
Bhrāmayan-sarva-bhūtāni yantrārūḍhāni māyayā

61. O Arjuna, the Lord, dwells in the hearts of all beings, whirling by Māyā all beings, (as if) on machines mounted.

O Arjuna, he who is of bright inner self, i.e. whose inner-sense (antaḥ-karaṇa) is extremely pure,—following the Sruti, "The dark day and the the bright day" (R.V. VI. ix. 1). where the word 'arjuna' is used in the sense of white or pure)—

the Lord (Īśvara), He who rules (over all) namely Nārāyaṇa, *dwells*, has His abode, *in the hearts of all beings*, living creatures;

How He dwells is being stated:

whirling, causing to resolve, *all beings, by Māyā*, deception, illusion, as if *on machines mounted*,—the expression 'as if' ("iva") has to be understood here;—in the same way as contrivances like dolls in the form of men made of wood are 'mounted on', directed (made to revolve)[95]. The word 'whirling' is to be taken with the word 'dwells'.

तमेव शरणं गच्छ सर्वभावेन भारत ।
तत्प्रसादात्परां शांन्ति स्थानं प्राप्स्यसि शाश्वतम् ॥ ६२ ॥

95. Contrivances such as those made of wood are made to whirl by a common juggler by illusion; in the same way the Lord causes all beings to whirl. (Ā)

Tam-eva śaraṇam gaccha sarva-bhāvena Bhārata
Tat-prasādāt-parām śāntin sthānam prāpsyasi
śāśvatam

62. Resort to Him alone as refuge with all your heart, O Bhārata; by His Grace shall you attain supreme peace (and) the Eternal Abode.

Resort to Him alone, the Lord (Īśvara), *as refuge*, for the removal of the distress of saṁsāra, *with all your heart*, with your whole being[96], *O Bhārata*; thereupon, *by His Grace* of Īśvara, *shall you attain supreme*, pre-eminent, *peace*, perfect indifference to worldly attachments, *and the Eternal Abode*[97], the Supreme State of Mine, Viṣṇu's.

इति ते ज्ञानमाख्यातं गुह्याद्गुह्यतरं मया ।
विमृश्यैतदशेषेण यथेच्छसि तथा कुरु ।। ६३ ।।

Iti te jñānam-ākhyātam guhyād-guhya-taram mayā
Vimṛśaitad-aśeṣeṇa yathecchasi tathā kuru

63. Thus has wisdom, more secret than all that is secret, been declared to you by Me; reflecting over it fully, act as you like.

Thus has wisdom, more secret than all that is secret, more mysterious than all that has to be guarded as secret, *been declared to you by Me*, the Omniscient Lord; *reflecting*, bestowing consideration, *over it*, the Śāstra, the teaching as declared above, *fully*, i.e. everything that has been taught, *act as you like*[98].

Hear what I am again going to say:

सर्वगुह्यतमं भूयः शृणु मे परमं वचः ।
इष्टोऽसि मे दृढमिति ततो वक्ष्यामि ते हितम् ।। ६४ ।।

96. i.e. by the working of the mind by speech, and by physical action. (Ā)
97. It is called 'abode', since the liberated abide in it. (Ā)
98. Practise Knowledge or Karma, whichever you wish. (Ā)

Sarva-guhya-tamam bhūyaḥ śṛṇu me paramam vacaḥ
Iṣṭo(a)si me dṛḍham-iti tato vakṣyāmi te hitam

64. Hear again My supreme word, the most secret of all; because you are My close favourite, therefore will I speak what is good for you.

Hear, again, though more than once declared, *My supreme word, the most secret of all* secrets,—which I am telling you not on account of doubt or from self-interest;

Then, why?—

Because you are My close favourite, ever, unshakably dear to Me, *therefore,* for that reason, *will I speak,* tell you, *what is good for you,* the supreme good, namely, the means of attaining Knowledge. That, indeed, is the most beneficial of all that is good

What is that? The Lord says:

मन्मना भव मद्भक्तो मद्याजी मां नमस्कुरु ।
मामेवैष्यसि सत्यं ते प्रतिजाने प्रियोऽसि मे ॥ ६५ ॥

Man-manā bhava mad-bhakto mad-yājī mām namaskuru
Mām-evaiṣyasi satyam te pratijāne priyo(a)si me

65. Occupy your mind with Me, be devoted to Me, sacrifice to Me, bow down to Me; you shall reach Myself. Truly do I asseverate unto you, (for) you are dear to Me.

Occupy your mind with Me, fix your thought on Me; *be devoted to Me,* be My worshipper; *sacrifice to Me,* be always disposed to sacrifice to Me; *bow own to Me,* pay your respectful obeisance also to Me alone. Thus acting, i.e. offering to Vāsudeva alone all your aims, means, and ends, *you shall reach Myself,* come to

Me. *Truly do I asseverate unto you*, I make a solemn promise in this matter; *for you are dear to Me.*

The meaning of this sentence is: thus, knowing the Lord to be true to His promise, and being convinced that devotion to the Lord certainly brings about Liberation (Mokṣa), one should devote himself exclusively to the Lord as his refuge.

Having concluded the teaching that the supreme secret of the Devotion of Karma-Yoga is taking refuge in the Lord (Īśvara), and now feeling that He should state the fruit of the Devotion of Karma-Yoga, as determined in all Vedāntas (Upaniṣads), namely, Right (Plenary) Knowledge, the Lord says:

सर्वधर्मान्परित्यज्य मामेकं शरणं व्रज ।
अहं त्वा सर्वपापेभ्यो मोक्षयिष्यामि मा शुचः ॥ ६६ ॥

Sarva-dharmān-parityajya mām-ekam śaraṇam vraja
Aham tvā sarva-pāpebhyo mokṣayiṣyāmi mā śucaḥ

66. Relinquishing all *dharmas*, take refuge in Me alone; I will liberate you from all sins; grieve not.

Relinquishing all dharmas—by the word 'dharma', even 'adharma' is to be understood, since absolute freedom from all action (naiṣkarmya) is intended to be taught here, as borne out by the following passages from Śruti and Smṛti:

"He who has not ceased from wicked acts (i.e. adharma)" (Ka.I.ii.24).

"Renounce dharma and adharma". (M.B. Śānti. 329. 40).

So, the meaning is: renouncing all actions (righteous and unrighteous,) *take refuge in Me alone*, the Self of all, the Same, dwelling in all beings, the Īśvara (Lord), the Permanent, destitute of (the several modification such as) being in the womb, birth, old age, and death, and the One, with the belief that I am verily That. The import is: "understand that there is nothing else besides Me".

I will liberate you, when you have this settled understanding, *from all sins*, all sorts of bondage occasioned by dharma and adharma, by manifesting Myself as your own Self. So has it been already said: "I, abiding in their Self, destroy the darkness (in them) by the luminous lamp of Knowledge". (X.11). Therefore, *grieve not*, do not give yourself over to sorrow.

*

(Now follows the concluding and conclusive discussion to determine which exactly is the Path advocated by the *Gitā*.)

What is it that has been settled in this *Gitā-śāstra* as the means to final beatitude (*niḥśreyas*—Highest Good, Highest Bliss)? Is it Knowledge, or Action, or both together?

Question:—Wherefrom this doubt?

Reply:—Passages such as, "Knowing which, one attains the Immortal" (XIII.12), "Then, having known Me in reality, he forthwith enters into Me,' (XVIII-55), demonstrate that the attainment of the highest bliss is through pure Knowledge (unattended by anything else). Such passages as, "Your right is to work only" (II. 47), "Do you, surely, perform action" (IV.15), teach that the performance of action is quite necessary. Since both Knowledge and works are thus taught to be obligatory duties, there may also arise the doubt that both of them conjointly might be the means to the Highest Bliss (of Liberation).—

Question:—What is the use of this enquiry?

Reply:—It is this to be sure, namely, to determine which one of the three (Knowledge, action and Knowledge-*plus*-action) is the means to the attainment of the Highest Bliss. Wherefore, this matter is fit to be investigated in extenso.

Pure Self-Knowledge is indeed the means to the Highest Bliss, since, as removing the belief in dualism (apprehension of difference), it culminates in the fruit of final emancipation (*kaivalya*). Notions of diversity, such as action, the factors of action, and the result of action, perpetually arise in the self through *avidyā*. "(This) action is mine", "I am (its) agent (doer)', "I am

doing this act for such and such a result",—in this form, *avidyā* has been functioning from time without beginning. What can put an end to this *avidyā* is the Knowledge concerning the Self, of this form, "I am truly this, the un-attached non-agent, free from action and from (its) results; there is nothing whatever other than myself", since it brings about, even as it arises, the cessation of the notion of diversity which is the cause of the propensity to action. The word 'indeed' (in the opening sentence of this paragraph: "Pure Self-Knowledge is *indeed*") signifies the setting aside of the other two alternatives, thus: neither by works alone, nor by Knowledge and works conjointly, is the Highest Good attainable. Besides, since the Highest Good is not an effect to be produced by any action, it is impossible that action can be the means to it. Eternal Reality (a self-existing thing) is not, indeed, produced either action or by Knowledge.

Question:—Even Pure Knowledge is of no use, then?

Reply:—Not so; by bringing about the cessation of *avidyā*, it culminates in the fruit, which is experienced, namely, emancipation. It is observed (from experience) that the knowledge which destroys the darkness of ignorance does culminate in emancipation, as its result. As for instance, in case of a rope etc., there is the result of the light of the lamp which removes darkness, namely the (cause for the) false knowledge of a serpent, etc. (superimposed on the rope etc.). The result of the light indeed culminates in the rope remaining detached, simply as a rope, the false notion of serpent having been completely turned away from it; so also with Knowledge (of the Self).

Indeed, it does not happen that the agent and other factors of action, which are concerned in the act of cutting (wood), the act of churning for fire, etc.,—acts whose results are visible and definite, can engage themselves (at the same time) in a different act whose result will be other than the severance (of wood) or the appearance of fire, etc. (as the case may be). In just the same way, it is impossible that the knower and other factors of (the) action (of knowing) which are occupied with the act of Knowledge-devotion (*jñāna-niṣṭhā*)—whose result is also definite and perceivable—can (at the same time) engage themselves in a different act

productive of a result other than the fruit (of *jñāna-niṣṭhā*), the emancipation of the Self. Wherefore, it does not stand to reason that the devotion of Knowledge can be conjoined with works.

Objection:—The two can be conjoined, just as the act of eating and the act of fire-worship (*agni-hotra*) etc.

Reply:—No;[99] because, when emancipation is the fruit of Knowledge, it is impossible (for the devotee of Knowledge) to be desirous of the fruits of actions. With the advantage of the all-spreading flood at hand, none can entertain the desire either to construct wells and tanks, or, for the fruits, securable by such acts of (construction); so also, when Knowledge, whose fruit is Emancipation, has been attained, it is verily impossible to desire any other lesser result or for engaging in any act as the means for obtaining that other result. As for instance, a person, busily engaged in an act whose purpose is to obtain a kingdom, cannot surely engage himself in an act which can (merely) secure a plot of land, or even entertain a desire concerning it. Therefore, work(s) cannot be the means to the Highest Bliss.

Nor can Knowledge and works conjointly be the means thereto. Neither is there for Knowledge, whose fruit is Emancipation, any need for the assistance of works[100]; for, being the destroyer of *avidyā*, it (Knowledge) is opposed (to works). Indeed, darkness cannot be the dispeller of darkness. Therefore, it is settled that Pure Knowledge alone (unaided) is the means to the Highest Bliss.

99. The secular act of eating is seen to be practised in conjunction with the sacred ritual of the performance of *agni-hotra* etc. Thi is quite understandable, for even when the fruit of the act of eating, namely satisfaction of hunger, has been attained, there remains the desire for *svarga* (heaven) and for the performance of the *agni-hotra* which is the means to it. Not so is the case with one who has taken to the devotion of Knowledge with *Mokṣa* as its fruit, since he can have no desire for *svarga* (etc.) or for its means, namely action. (Ā)

100. Though Knowledge depends on the performance of works, *yajña* etc., for its orgination, when once it has been produced, there is no further need for them in leading to the fruit. liberation. (Ā) (Knowledge is said to "originate" from works only in the sense that it is by the *chitta-Śuddhi* (cleansing of the mind) effected by the performance of the prescribed *karma* (works) that one is equipped with the eligibility to enter into the path of Knowledge.)

Objection:—It cannot be so; for, by the non-performance of the obligatory duties (*nitya-karmas*) one incurs the sin of *pratyavāya*; and Emancipation (*Kaivalya*) is eternal. (To explain: What has just been said, that Emancipation is secured through Knowledge alone, is wrong; since, by the non-performance of the obligatory works (*nitya-karmas*) prescribed by Śruti, one incurs the sin of *pratyavāya*, leading (him) to hell, etc.[101]

Counter-objection:—Thus, then, as *mokṣa* cannot be attained by works, there can be no (such things as attaining) *mokṣa* at all[102].

The Objector:—There is no room for your objection, since *mokṣa* is eternal[103]. Through the performance of the obligatory works (—prescribed acts), the sin of *pratyavāya* is not incurred, by the avoidance of the prohibited acts, there is no production of (birth in) undesirable bodies; and by eschewing interested; (*kāmya*) acts, there is no production of (birth in) desirable bodies. And, when the present body falls on the exhaustion of the enjoyment of the fruits of the actions which have produced this body, there being no cause which can give rise to another body, and due to the non-entertainment of attachment etc. towards himself[104], there ensues abidance in one's true nature, which is tself Emancipation; thus, Emancipation is attained without any effort.

Counter-objection:—The actions done in the past eseveral births, capable of leading to heaven, hell, etc., and which have not yet commenced their effects, would still remain undestroyed, since their effects could not have been enjoyed.

101. It follows that the performance of obligatory works is necessary even for the man of Knowledge; and so Knowledge by itself cannot be the means to emancipation. (Ā)

102. Even if the performance of the obligatory (*nitya*) and the occasional (*naimittika*) works be inevitable, their performance, whether in conjunction with Knowledge or not, cannot be the means to *mokṣa*, as already explained. And, Knowledge by itself (you say) cannot lead to *mokṣa*. Therefore *mokṣa* is impossible, being without any cause which could produce it. (Ā)

103. And therefore it is secured without any effort. (Ā). The "eternal" does not need a cause to provide it.

104. Since attachment etc. lead one to action, which in turn gives rise to a body, absence of attachment etc. is mentioned as what prevents another birth. (Ā)

Objector:—No; since (—as we hold—) it is possible that the fruit of such action is experienced in the form of the trouble and pain involved in the performance of the obligatory duties. Or, the *nitya-karmas*, like expiatory rites (*prāyaścitta*), serve the purpose of destroying sins previously acquired[105]. Since works which have begun (their effects) are exhausted through enjoyment (of their fruits) and since no new works are commenced, it follows that Emancipation is attained without any effort.

Reply:—No; for the *Śruti* declares that there is no path to *mokṣa*, other than Knowledge: "Knowing Him alone, one crosses beyond death; there is no other path to final Emancipation". (*Śv*.III.8). The *Śruti* further declares that it is as impossible for the ingorant (non-Knowledged) person to attain to *mokṣa* as it is for men to roll up the sky like leather. (*Śv*.VI.20). And the Purāṇic canon also declares that one attains to Emancipation (only) by Knowledge.

Moreover, it is not possible to persume the extinction of the virtuous deeds which have not yet commenced their effects. Just as the existence of sins, acquired in the past and whose effects have not commenced, is possible, so also is the existence of virtuous deeds which have not commenced their effects possible. And, since these cannot be exhausted without producing a new body, *mokṣa* is not possible.

Neither is it possible to put an end to *dharma* (merit) and *dharma* (demerit), since the eradication of attachment, hatred, and delusion, which form the cause of *dharma* and *adharma*, cannot be brought about except by the Knowledge of the Self. Also, since it is declared by *Śruti*, that the *nitya-karmas* lead to auspicious regions (*puṇya-loka*) as their result, and by *Smṛti* that persons belonging to the several castes and orders of life, each firmly adhering to the practice of the duties prescribed for him.

105. It may be doubted that *nitya-karmas*, though capable of removing sins, cannot—by reason of their not being hostile—eradicate good deeds; and so there will be another body (in which to experience the result of the good deeds). As against this, we hold that good deeds being of the same kind as i.e. non-different from, *nitya-karmas*, cannot have a different (separate) fruits; they all end with the extinction of sins previously acquired, in the same way as *prāyaścitta* rites, and cannot produce another body. (Ā)

enjoy the fruits of their actions after death, etc.: (*Āp*. II. ii.-2, 3) *Gau*. II. 29), the extinction of works is not possible.

As for those who say that the *nitya-karmas*, being painful in their nature, are themselves the fruit of sinful actions performed in the past; and apart from themselves they have no other fruit since no mention thereof is made in *Śruti*, and their performance has been enjoined (merely) as conditioned by one's (mode of) life, etc.,—we refute their view, because it is not possible for actions which have no commenced their effects to yield any fruit, and it cannot therefore be said that the pain (involved in the performance of *nitya-karma*) is a peculiar effect of (other) actions (sins committed in the past).

(To explain:) What you say—that the fruit of sinful acts committed in past births is experienced in the form of pain namely the trouble involved in the performance of *nitya-karma*,—is not right. It does not, indeed, stand to reason that the fruits of the actions, which had not sprouted up towards fruition at the moment of death, are experienced in the birth which is produced by other actions. Else, it cannot be gainsaid that the fruit of those actions which would lead to hell is (simultaneously) enjoyed in the (very) birth which has been brought into being by deeds such as the *Agni-hotra* (fire-sacrifice) for the enjoyment of their (due) fruit, namely heaven (*svarga*).

Besides, it is unreasonable to hold that the trouble and pain (involved in the performance of *nitya-karma*) is a peculiar effect of sins (committed in the past). It is quite possible that there exist several sinful acts which are productive of different kinds of suffering as their fruit; and you suppose that they all have as their sole fruit the mere trouble and pain involved in the performance of *nitya-karma*. Then, it would be impossible to fix the cause of the sufferings caused by the pairs of opposites or by disease and the like,[106] the trouble and pain involved in the performance of *nitya-karma* alone being the effect of the sinful acts of the past, but not the pain of carrying a stone on the head and the like[107]!

106. since they cannot be the results of good acts (*sukṛta*). (Ā)

107. which must therefore be causeless, not being the effect of sinful acts and impossible of being the effect of virtuous acts. (Ā)

Moreover, what you have said,—that the trouble and pain involved in the performance of *nitya-karma* is the result of the sinful deeds done in the past—iṣ not to the point. How? The point raised for consideration was that there is no possibility of the extinction of sins committed in the past, which have not originated their effects; in that context, your reply (could only have) meant that the trouble and pain involved in the performance of *nitya-karmas* was the result of the acts which have commenced (given birth to) their fruits, and not of the acts which have not yet originated their reults. But if you think that the sins committed in the past have, in their entirely, begun to produce fruit, then, it is wrong to specify that the trouble and pain involved in the performance of *nitya-karma* are alone the fruit. That would also lead to the conclusion that the scriptural injunction as to *nitya-karma*[108] serves no purpose, since the extinction of the sinful acts which (all) have begun to yield their results will e brought about merely by suffering those results. And, besides, if pain be occasioned in the performance of *nitya-karma*, enjoined by *Śruti*, it is plainly seen to arise from the *effort* involved in the performance of the n*nitya-Karma* itself, in the same way as (pain from) a thletic exercise etc.; and therefore it is not reasonable to suppose that it is (the fruit) of another (action).

Also, if the *nitya-karmas* are enjoined merely as conditioned by one's mode of life, etc. it is unreasonable to hold that they are the effects of the sinful acts of the past, any more than an expiatory act (*prāyaścitta*) can be. An expiatory act which is prescribed with regard to a particular sinful acton is not the fruit of that sinful action[109]. But if (it be said that) the pain involved in the expiratory act is the fruit of the sinful act which necessitates it (the *prāyaścitta*), then it would follow that even the trouble and pain involved in the performance of *nitya-karma* which is (prescribed as) occasioned by a man's mode of life, etc., is only the effect of the very circumstances of his mode of life etc., since *nitya-karma* and *prāyaścitta* are a like occasioned (by particular contingencies).

Moreover, since the trouble in perfomring the *nitya-aganihotra* [fire-worship as an obligatory (i.e. motiveless) duty] and the *kāmya-*

108. for the removal of past sins. (Ā)

109. and similarly the *nitya-karmas* cannot be the effects of past sins. (Ā)

agnihotra (fire-worship with a motive) is the same, there can be no reason for such distinction as that the trouble and pain involved in the performance of the *nitya-agnihotra* is alone the effect of past sins, while the trouble and pain involved in the *kāmya-agnihotra* is not; and consequently it would follow that the latter is also the result of sins committed in the past. Such being the case, it would be wrong to make the supposition by *arthāpatti* (presumption or inference employed to account for an apparent inconsistency[110]) that, since no mention is made in *Śruti* of the fruit of *nitya-karma* and since its injunction is not otherwise accountable, the trouble and pain involved in the performance of *nitya-karma* is the fruit of sins committed in the past. Thus, for the very reason that the injunction (as to *nitya-karma*) is not otherwise explicable, we should even infer that the *nitya-karmas* have fruits different from the trouble and pain involved in their performance[111].

There is also the fault of inconsistency (in the statements of the objector). When it is accepted (by the objector) that through the performance of the *nitya-karma* the fruit of other action (past sins) is being experienced, such experience itself is the fruit of *nitya-karma*; and to assert that there is no fruit for *nitya-karma* is therefore inconsistent.

Moreover, when the *kāmya-agnihotra* (etc.) is performed, the *nitya-agnihotra* (etc.) is also held to have been performed through the same ritual; and, consequently, the fruit of the *kāmya-agnihotra* (etc.) should become extinguished through the trouble and pain (involved in the performance of the rite), since it (the *kāmya-agnihotra*) has the same ritual act as (or rests on) the *nitya-agnihotra*[112]. If on the other hand, the fruit of the *kāmya-agnihotra* (etc.) be something else, such as heaven (*svarga*), the trouble and pain involved in its performance should be different; but it is not so, being contrary to observed fact. In fact, the trouble and pain

110. The familiar example of *arthāpatti.*:—When it is said that 'the fat Devadatta does not eat in day-time, the apparent inconsistency between 'fatness' and 'not eating in day-time' is accounted for by the inference of his 'catting in night-time'.

111. as is the case with *kāmya-karma.* (Ā)

112. just as through the trouble and pain involved in the performance of *nitya-karma*, the effect of past sinful acts could get exhaused. (A)

involved in the performance of the mere *nitya*-rite is not different from that in the performance of the *kāmya*-rite.

Also this: an act which is neither enjoined nor prohibited (by Scripture) is productive of immediate result; but an act prescribed or prohibited by Scripture cannot be productive of immediate result. If it should, then none will make effort in accordance with scriptural injunctions for attaining unseen results, even those such as *svarga* (heaven)[113].

It is not possible to imagine that only in respect of the *agni-hotra* (etc.) performed as a *nitya-karma* the result is exhausted by the mere trouble and pain undergone in its performance, even though there is no difference in the form (anture) of the act; but that when performed with motive (*kāmya*) the same rite is productive of superior results such as *snarga*, merely because there is the desire for the fruit, even though there is no superiority in tbe consituent parts of the rite or in the mode of its performance.

Therefore, it is on no account proper to deny the production of unseen results with respect to *nitya-karmas.*

And, it is thus settled that Knowledge alone can bring about the complete destruction of actions, good and evil, caused by *avidyā,* and not the performance of *nitya-karma*[114]. For , all *karma* does originate from *avidyā* (nescience) and *kāma* (desire). It has been so established—that the path of action (*karma-yoga*) pertains to the un-enlightened and that the devotion to Knowledge (*jñāna-niṣṭhā*) accompanied with renunciation of all works pertains to the wise: (vide passages such as the following):—

"Neither of these knows" (II.19);

"The man who knows This to be indestructible...."(II.21);

113. That *svarga* and the like are not immediately attainable is opposed to the view that scriptural rites produce (only) immediate results. None will care for such unseen fruits and engage in the prescribed rites. (Ā)

114. Like the *kārmya-karmas*, the *nitya-karmas* also produce unseen results such as (leading to) the region of the manes (*pitṛ-loka*) and the like. They are not intended for the destruction of sins. Therefore, it should be accepted that Self-knowledge alone can produce that result (of destroying actions). (Ā)

"By *Jñāna-yoga* for the Sāṁkhyas, (and) by *karma-yoga* for the yogins" (III.3);

"Of the un-enlightened, attached to action" (III.26);

"But he who knows the Truth......, recognising that *guṇas* (merely) act on *guṇas*, does not become attached" (III.28).

"Having renounced all actions by the mind, rests"........ (V. 13);

"The knower of Truth, (being) centred (in the Self) should think, 'I do nothing...' " (V.8),) meaning that it is (only) the un-enlightened man who thinks that he is the agent;

"For the *muni* who wishes to attain to *yoga*, work is said to be the means; for the same person when he has attained to *yoga*, inaction (*śama*) is said to be the means" (VI.3);

"Noble indeed are all these (three), though not illumined; but the wise man I regard as My very Self" (VII. 18);

"The un-enlightened who perform actions, desiring desires, they come and go". (IX.21);

"Those persons who meditate on Me as non-separate, ever-devoted", worship (Me) the Self, pure as the *ākāsa*. (IX.22);

"To them, I give that *Buddhi-yoga*, by which they come unto Me" (X.10),—implying that the un-enlightened who follow the path of action cannot reach (the Lord).

Those who render service to the Lord, though even steadfast, are followers of the path of action and un-illumined, and they resort to one of the means mentioned in descending order, the last of which is the abandonment of the fruit of action (XIII.8 to 11). But those who contemplate the Indefinable and Imperishable possess the aids mentioned, beginning from "hating no creature" and ending with the close of that Chapter (XII. 13 to 20) and they are also possessed of the means to Knowledge stated in the three Chapters beginning with that on the *Kṣetra*.[115] The three-

115. Chap. XIII. 7 to 11; Chap. XIV. 22 to 26, and Chap. XV. 3 to 5'. (Ā)

fold fruit of action, the disagreeable and the rest (XVIII.12), does not accrue only to those, (v.12) the Paramahamsa Parivrājakas, (the highest order of *saṁnyāsins*,) who have renounced all actions which are produced by the five causes, the seat and the rest (XVIII. 14), who have realised that the Self is One and non-agent, agent, who are ever engaged in the supreme devotion of Knowledge, who know the true nature of the Lord, and who have found refuge in the identity of the Lord's Being and the Self. And, it does accrue to the others, the un-enlightened who follow the path of action and are not *saṁnyāsins*. This is the apportionment of the duty to action and the duty to non-action mentioned in the *Gītā-śāstra*.

Objection:—It cannot be established that all actions are caused by *avidya*[116].

Reply:—No; it can be, as is the case with "the killing of the Brāhmaṇa,' (*brahmahatyā*, a prohibited act) etc. Although the *nitya-karma* is declared by the Śāstra, it is intended only for the un-enlightened person. An act such as *brahma-hatyā*, productive of evil, which is declared as prohibited act in the *Śastra*, is committed only by a person who is un-enlightened and given to desire and other evil tendencies, his engagement (in that act) being otherwise inexplicable. So also the obligatory (*nitya*), occasional (*naimittika*) and interested (*kāmya*) rites (are possible only for the person who is un-enlightened and has desires).

Objector:—There is no possibility of engaging in the performance of *nitya* etc.-*karmas*, so long as one does not know the Self as different (from the body etc.)[117].

Reply:—Not so; because we find man engaging in action with the thought, 'I do that act'[118], which (action being of the nature

116. since it is not reasonable to suppose that the actions learnt through Scripture are caused by *avidyā*. (Ā)

117. Without the knowledge that the Self is different from the body etc., engagement in actions which are productive of results in the other world is not possible; and therefore those actions cannot be due to ingoiance. (Ā)

118. Though there is the idea of the Self being different (from body, etc.), true Knowledge concerning the Self is absent, and so he engages in action through false knowledge (*mithyā-jñāna*). (Ā)

of motion is effected (only) by the not-Self (cannot be due to the agency of the Self).

Objector:—The conception of the aggregate of the body etc. as the Self is only figurative (*gauṇa*); it is not an illusion (*mithyā*).

Reply:—That is not correct, for, then, its actions also should be held to be figurative[119].

Objector (explains):—The conception as 'self' of the aggregate of the body etc., which belong to one-self, is figurative, as (for instance) when the *Śruti* says with reference to one's own son, "Thou, spoken of as son, art myself", (*Tai.Saṁ.*II.11) and in common usage also we say "this cow is verily my life"; (and speaking of the aggregate etc. as the self) is similar. This conception is certainly not an illusory notion(*mithyā-pratyaya*). Illusory notion (of human being) occurs only when it is not possible to distinguish two objects, a pillar and a man (for example) (when in darkness, the pillar is mistaken for a man.)

Reply:—A figurative conception (*gauṇa-pratyaya*) is not intended to bring about the effect of the primary (real) object, since its purpose is merely to extol the subject, through epithets forming an elliptical simile[120]. For instance, the statements, "Devadatta is a lion", and "The student is fire" are intended merely to extol Devadatta and the student, the subjects, because, by possessing ferocity one is similar to the lion, and by being reddish-brown the other is similar to fire; but no action whatever of a (real) lion or of (real) fire is effected in consequence of the idea, conveyed by that figurative expresseion. On the other hand man does undergo the effect of illusory notion (*mithyā-pratyaya*), namely evil (of *saṁsāra*).

Besides, one knows the scope of the figurative conception, namely, that this Devadatta is no lion, that this student is not

119. And consequently no evil will befall the Self, for the riddance of which an expedient need be sought. (Ā)

120. *Luptopamā*—a mutilated simile in which some of the requisites are omitted.

P—40

fire[121]. And, also the action which is done by the aggregate of the body etc., the figurative 'self', should not be deemed to be the action of the real self which is the subject of the concept of "I"; for, indeed, any action done by a 'figurative' lion or fire cannot become an act of a real lion or fire, and no purpose whatever of a real lion or fire is served by the ferocity (of Devadatta) or the reddish-brown colour (of the student), since they lapse by serving the purpose of extolling (the respective subjects). Moreover, even the person who is so extolled knows that he is not a lion, or that he is not fire, and that the action of a lion or of fire (respectively) is not his; and similarly it would be more appropriate to have the cognition, 'The action of the aggregate of the body etc. is not mine, the real Self", instead of the conception, "I am the agent, mine is the action[122]".

And as to the doctrine that the Self acts, having his own memory, desire and effort as the causes of action, (we say that) such is not the case, since they (memory etc.) originate from false perception (*mithyā-pratyaya*, illusion). Memory, desire and effort, indeed proceed from the impressions generated by the experience of the fruits, desirable and undesirable, of action occasioned by false perception (illusion). Just as in the present birth, *dharma* and *adharma*, and the experience of their results, are the result of the identification of the Self with the aggregate of the body etc., and of attachment and hatred and the like so also in the previous birth, and that prior to it, and so on; and it has accordingly to be inferred that *saṁsāra*, past and future, is without a beginning and the product of ignorance (*avidyā*). From this also, it is settled that the absolute cessation of *saṁsāra* is attainable only through the renunciation of all action, in the devotion of Knowledge. Indeed, since attachment to the body is of the nature of *avidyā*, on the removal of *avidyā*, there cannot be (connection with a body), and consequently involvement in *saṁsarā*.

121. But, even though the Self and the aggregate of the body etc. are different, an un-enlightened person takes the aggregate to be the Self; and therefore the description and the perception of the aggregate as the Self cannot be figurative. (Ā)

122. Since it is not so, the concept of "I" with regard to the body etc. cannot be figurative. (Ā)

The conception of self-hood with respect to the aggregate of the body etc. is of the nature of *avidyā*[123]. Indeed, in ordinary life, nobody who knows thus: "I am different from the cow and others; and the cow and others are different from me", would entertain the idea that they are himself. But, ignorant (of the difference), as is the case with the cognition of a human being in a tree-trunk (as when the tree-trunk is, in darkness, mistaken for a man), it is possible to entertain the idea of self-hood with respect to the aggregate of the body etc. (i.e. identify the Self with them), through lack of discrimination; and not when one knows (their difference) through discrimination.

As for the notion as one's own self with respect to the son, referred to in, "Thou, spoken of as son, are myself" (*Tai.Saṁ.*II.11) it is a figurative one, caused by the relationship of generator and off-spring. And no purpose of the real self, such as taking food etc.[124], can be fulfilled by the 'figurative' self; as for example, the figurative lion and fire cannot fulfil the purposes of the true lion and fire[125].

Objector:—Scriptural injunctions being the authority with respect to matters unseen, the purposes of the self are (surely) effected by what are figuratively (spoken of as) the self—the body, senses etc.[126]

Reply:—No; their self-hood is the creation of *avidyā*; the body, senses, etc. are not 'selves' in the figurative sense. What

123. The Self is considered as the agent of the acts of *dharma* and *adharma* through *avidyā*; consequently, a person devoted to action cannot identify himself with the body except through *avidyā*. (A)

124. By a person's figurative self (the son) taking food, the feeding of the father is not accomplished. So also, if the body etc. are only figuratively spoken of as the self, then they cannot fulfil any purpose of the self, such as being an agent. (A)

125. Devadatta cannot perform any of the acts of the lion; nor can the student perform the action of real fire, such as burning and boiling. (Ā)

126. Scriptural injunctions such as, "One who desires *svarga* (heaven) should sacrifice" are authoritative. The self is indeed known to be different from the body etc., but it cannot engage in action by itself (alone); and so, the action to be performed by the self is accomplished by the 'figurative' self. (Ā)

then? Their self-hood is brought about through false conception (illusion) alone, by being associated with the Self which is unattached; for, they are regarded as the self when the illusion subsists, and are not so regarded when the illusion disappears. Indeed, it is only in thoughtless, childish persons, when they are under the sway of ignorance, that the notion of selfhood in the aggregate of the body etc. in such forms as, "I am tall", "I am yellowish" is noticed; but to the discerning, when they have the knowledge "I am different from the aggregate of the body etc.", the notion of self-hood in the aggregate of the body etc. cannot arise. Therefore, being on-existent in the absence of illusion (false-knowledge), this (notion of self-hood in the body etc.) is a product of illusion alone; and it is not a figurative notion. It is only with respect to two things whose difference and similarity can be separately perceived, as in the case of a lion and Devadatta, or fire and a student, that conception in a figurative sense or speaking figuratively is possible; not with respect to those whose similarity and difference cannot be perceived[127].

As regard the contention based on *Śruti* being authoritative we say that it is not proper; for *Śruti* is authoritative (only) with respect to matters unseen[128]. *Śruti* is indeed the authority in matters not comprehended through the ordinary means of acquiring knowledge, namely *pratyaksa* (direct perception by the senses) and the rest,—i.e. in such matters as the mutual relation of ends and means of the *Agni-hotra* and the like; but not in matters known through *pratyakṣa* and the rest, since the very authoritativeness (of *Śruti*) lies in its revealing what is not (otherwise) perceivable. Thus, it is not possible to imagine that the notion of "I" with respect to the aggregate of the body etc., which has been ascertained as due to illusion (*mithyā-jñāna*), (by the Wise, in their direct experience) is a figurative idea. Not even a hundred *Śruti* texts which state that fire is cold or that it is dark can acquire authoritativeness[129]. If *Śruti* should at all mention that fire is cold or

127. Consequently with respect to the subject on hand, since perception of difference, which is an invariable feature of figurativeness, is absent, the conception of selfhood with respect to the body etc. cannot be figurative. (Ā)

128. i.e. those which are beyond the range of human knowledge. (Ā)

129. because, it is contrary to what is directly experienced. (Ā)

that it is dark, we will have to suppose that the *Śruti*'s intention was to convey a different meaning, for the authoritativeness (of *Śruti*) cannot otherwise be maintained; and we should not attach to it (*Śruti*) a meaning which contradicts other means to knowledge (*pramāṇas*) or its own statement.

Objection:—Since action can be engaged in only by a person who is subject to illusion, when there is no such agent[130], *Śruti* proves to be futile as authority.

Reply:—Not so; for *Śruti* would still be purposeful with respect to *Brahma-vidyā*, the Science of the Self[131].

Objection:—As with the *Śruti* which enjoins works, the *Śruti* which teaches *Brahma-vidyā* can also cease to be authoritative (in the absolute sense).

Reply:—Not so; for there is no concept that can annual *Brahma-vidyā*. In the manner that the conception of self in the aggregate of the body etc. is annihilated when the Self (in its true form) is comprehended from the *Śruti* which teaches Brahma-vidyā, there is nothing whatever which can at any time or in any manner set aside this comprehension of the Self in oneself; for that perception is never separated from the result[132], just as fire is (itself) heat and luminosity.

Moreover it is not correct to say that the *Śruti* enjoining works becomes unauthoritative; since, by restraining the earlier activities one after another and thereby bringing into existence newer and newer activities, its purpose is to create the tendency to turn to-

130. on the cessation of *avidyā*, due to the dawn of *Knowledge*. (Ā)

131. Though the *Śruti* teaching of works (*Karma-kāṇḍa*), which is of practical validity as the authority in matters of the phenomenal world prior to the dawn of Knowledge, may cease to be authoritative in the absolute sense (—with regard to the Absolute Truth), the *Śruti* teaching of Brahman (*Brahman-kāṇḍa*), which is of absolute validity (as being authoritative with respect to the Reality), is purposeful, since it can generate the Knowledge of Brahman.

132. The removal of *avidyā* is the result of *Brahma-vidyā*. (Ā)

wards the inner Self[133]. Though the means may be illusory, still it is true (as the means) since the end is true, as in the case of *arthavādas*, which are explanatory statements subsidiary to a main injunction. Even in the ordinary ways of the world, when a child or an insane person is to be induced to drink milk, we find that he is told (by way of inducement) that thereby his hair will grow, and so on. And, they (the *Śrutis* enjoining *karma*) are authorities by themselves for persons in different circumstances[134], in the same way that *pratyakṣa* and other *pramāṇas*, based on attachment to the body, are authoritative prior to (the dawn of) the Knowledge of the Self.

There is, then, this doctrine which you hold[135]: Though the Self is not directly engaged in action, he does act by his mere presence; and that itself constitutes the true agency of the Self. As is well-known, when his soliders are fighting, a king is said to be engaged in battle, by reason of his mere presence,even though he does not himself fight; and he is (similarly) said to be victorious or vanquished[136]. So also the commander of an army acts by mere word[137]. And we accept the connection of the king and the commander with the result of the act. Also, just as the acts of the priests officiating at a sacrifice (*ṛtviks*) are deemed to be those of the sacrificer (*yajamāna*)[138], likewise it may be deemed that the

133. By restraining the manifestations of natural (animal) activity, which have been functioning from time without beginning, the injunctions, of Śruti in the *Karma-kāṇḍa* bring about activities of the supernatural kind, suc as the performance of sacrifices, which, through the purification of the mind produce the tendency to turn towards the Self within; thus, as serving to lead step by step to the Knowledge of the inner Self, the injunctions of *Śruti* with regard f action are truly authoritative. (Ā)

134. 'Different circumstances' refers to the state prior to the dawn of Self-knowledge; for those in that state, the Śrutis enjoining works are directly (i.e. independently of *Brahma-vidyā*) authoritative as revealing the connection (of those works with their results) which cannot otherwise be known. (Ā)

135. in support of the view that the Self is an agent in the real sense. (Ā)

136. This is an example (from worldly practice) of real agency accruing from mere presence. (Ā)

137. An example to show that even in the absence of bodily activity there can be real agency. (Ā)

138. This is an example from Vedic usage. (Ā)

acts of the body etc. are done by the Self (iteslef), since their results go to the Self. And, just as a lodestone (magnet), itself not active, is truly the agent, by reason of its causing a piece of iron to move about, so (is the case) with the Self.—We say that this doctrine is wrong, since it leads to the conclusion that that which does not act is a doer (*kāraka*).

Objector:—Agency (doership) is of various kinds.

Reply:—Not so; for we find that the king and others (mentioned as examples) are also direct agents (engaged in action). In the first place, the king may even by his own activity be engaged in the fighting; and by reason of his causing the soldiers to fight and paying them money (as wages), his agency is direct and real (in the fighting); so also is it in experiencing the result, victory or defeat. Similarly with regard to the sacrificer, by reason of his offering the principal oblation and giving presents to the Brāhmaṇas (*ṛtviks*) at the completion of the sacrifice, his agency is quite real. Consequently, it is concluded that the ascription, by courtesy, of agency to a person who is not actually engaged in the action is only a figurative expression. If real (direct) agency—characterised by personal activity— be not understandable in the case of the king, the sacrificer, and such others, then we might suppose that there is real agency (in them) even through their being simply present, as in the case of the lodestone causing the piece of iron to move about. But we cannot conceive of the king, the sacrificer and such others engaging in action of their own in that manner. Wherefore, agency ascribed through mere presence can be figurative only. Such being the case, the connection with its results also shall be figurative only. By a 'figurative' agent, no action of the principal' is performed. Therefore, what is stated (by you), that through the activity of the body etc.the non-active Self becomes the doer and enjoyer, is improper.

On the other hand, all this[139] becomes reasonable when delusion is taken to be the cause, as in the case of a dream and jugglery (enchantment, *māyā*). Also, because, the evils such as agency and enjoyership cease to be experienced in deep sleep, *samadhi*

139. The Self being regarded as agent, (enjoyer), etc. (Ā)

and similar states, where there is break in the continuity of the delusion which conceives the body etc. to be the Self.

Wherefore, it is established that the illusion of *saṁsara* is simply the effect of a false conception and that it is not absolutely real; and, consequently its total extinction is brought about only by Right (Plenary) Knowledge.

Having in this Chapter concluded the whole substance of the *Gītā-śāstra*, and, with a view to confirming the Teaching of the *Śāstra*, having specially stated it, briefly and conclusively, here at the end[140] the Lord now proceeds to lay down the code as to the handing down of the Teaching:

इदं ते नातपस्काय नाभक्ताय कदाचन ।
न चाशुश्रूषवे वाच्यं न च मां योऽभ्यसूयति ॥ ६७ ॥

Idam te nātapaskāya nābhaktāya kadācana
Na cāśuśrūṣave vācyam na ca mām yo(a)bhyasūyati

67. This *Gīta-Śāstra*, taught) to you, is never to be told to one who is devoid of austerities; nor to one without devotion, nor to one who does not render service; nor to one who cavils at Me.

This (*Gītā*) Śāstra, which has been taught *to you* by Me for your good, for the destruction of saṁsāra, *is never*, under no circumstances whatever, *to be told to one who is devoid of austerities; nor to one*, who though practising austerities, is *without devotion* to the Preceptor (Guru) and to God (Deva); *nor* should it be told *to one who*, though devoted and practising austerities, *does not render service*[141]; *nor to one who cavils at Me*, who, taking Me, Vāsudeva, to be an ordinary mortal, knows Me not to be the Lord (Īśvara), erroneously attributes to Me faults such as indulging in self-praise, and does not accept the idea that I am the Lord;

140. in verse 66. (Ā)

141. The word, '*aśuśrūṣu*', literally means 'one who does not wish to hear and learn'; and one who wants to learn must render service (IV. 34). Serving the Guru and hearing and learning from the Guru are meant.

such a person also is un-deserving; and this (Śāstra) should not be told to him also.

By implication it is understood that the *Śāstra* is to be taught to him who is devoted to the Lord, who is a man of austerities, who renders service (wishing to hear and learn), and who does not cavil at the Lord.

Now, from the (scriptural) statement made elsewhere, "either to an intelligent person or to a man of austerities", we understand that the two are alternatives, Accordingly, this *Śāstra* is to be taught to a man of austerities who renders service and is devoted, or to a man of intelligence possessed of the said two attributes. It should not be taught to a man of austerities, or to a man of intelligence, if he does not render service and is not devoted. It should not be taught to him also, who cavils at the Lord, even if he possesses all the (other) merits. It should be taught to one who renders service to the teacher and is devoted. This is the code as to the handing down of the *Śāstra*.

Now the Lord states the results accruing to him who hands down the (*Gītā*-) Teaching:

य इमं परमं गुह्यं मद्भक्तेष्वभिधास्यति ।
भक्तिं मयि परां कृत्वा मामेवैष्यत्यसंशयः ॥ ६८ ॥

Ya imam paramam guhyam mad-bhakteṣvabhidhāsyati
Bhaktim mayi parām kṛtvā māmevaiṣyatyasaṁśayaḥ

68. He who with supreme devotion to Me will teach this Supreme Secret to My devotees shall doubtless come to Myself.

He who will teach this, establish this aforesaid Śāstra in the form of a dialogue between (Me), Keśava and Arjuna, by teaching both the text itself and its import, as I have established it by teaching it to you;

Supreme Secret, being the means to the Highest Bliss,

to My devotees, to those who have devotion to Me;—by the repetition of 'devotion' here, it is understood that by merely having devotion to the Lord one becomes worthy of being taught the *Śāstra*.—How one should teach it is being stated:

with supreme devotion to Me, with the conviction "I am (thus) engaged in the service of the Lord, the Supreme Guru"

For such a person, this is the fruit: he *shall doubtless come to Myself*, he will be liberated; of this no doubt need be entertained.

And,

न च तस्मान्मनुष्येषु कश्चिन्मे प्रियकृत्तमः ।
भविता न च मे तस्मादन्यः प्रियतरो भुवि ॥ ६९ ॥

Na ca tasmān-manuṣyeṣu kaścin me priya-kṛt-tamaḥ
Bhavitā na ca me tasmād-anyaḥ priya-taro bhuvi

69. Nor, among men, is there any who does dearer service to Me than he; nor shall there be another on earth dearer to Me than he.

Nor, among men, of the present generation, *is there any who does dearer service to Me than he* who hands the (this) Śāstra; *nor shall there be* in future time as well, *another*, a person different from such an one, *on earth*, in this world, *dearer to Me than he.*

अध्येष्यते च य इमं धर्म्यं संवादमावयोः ।
ज्ञानयज्ञेन तेनाहमिष्टः स्यामिति मे मतिः ॥ ७० ॥

Adhyeṣyate ca ya imam dharmyam samvādam-āvayoḥ
Jñāna-yajñena tenāham-iṣṭaḥ syām-iti me matiḥ

70. And he who will study this sacred dialogue of ours, by him shall I have been worshipped by the *yajña* of knowledge; such is My belief.

And he, who will study, learn, *this sacred* work, which does not deviate from dharma, in the form of *a dialogue of ours, by him*

this will be effected: *I shall have been worshipped by the yajna of knowledge*: of the four kinds of yajña, namely, Vidhi (ritual), Japa (prayer uttered in loud voice), Upāṁśu (prayer uttered in whisper), and Mānasa (prayer offered with the mind), jñāna-yajña (the yajña of knowledge) comes under the head of Mānasa, and is therefore the highest.

Thus the study of the Gītā-sāstra is extolled as jñāna-yajña.

Or, this may be regarded, as ordaining the result (which would follow from the act of studying this Śāstra), namely, that it would produce an effect equal to that of the yajña of knowledge, of the contemplation of a deity (Devata) and the like.

By this study, I shall have been worshipped (through the yajña of knowledge);

Such is My belief, judgment.

Now this is the good which accrues to the hearer:

श्रद्धावाननसूयश्च श‍ृणुयादपि यो नरः ।
सोऽपि मुक्तः शुभाँल्लोकान्प्राप्नुयात्पुण्यकर्मणाम् ॥ ७१ ॥

Śraddhāvān-anasūyaśca śṛṇuyād-āpi yo naraḥ
So(a)pi muktaḥ śubhāṁllokān-prāpnuyāt-puṇya- karmaṇām

71. And the man, who, full of *śraddhā,* and free from malice, merely hears, even he, liberated, shall attain to the happy worlds of those of righteous deeds.

And the man, who, being *full of śraddhā,* faith, *and free from malice,* merely hears this work,—the word 'merely' ("api") signifies that much more so will be the case with one who understands the Teaching—, *even he, liberated* from sin, *shall attain to the happy,* auspicious, *worlds of those of righteous deeds,* who have performed the Agnihotra and such rites.

With a view to knowing whether his pupil has understood or not the Teaching of the (*Gītā*), *Śāstra,* the Lord (now) questions

him (V.72). The object of the questioner (the Lord) is this: "If I find that he has not grasped it, I shall make him understand it even through some other means.'' By this, it is made known that the duty of the teacher (*ācārya*) is to resort to diverse attempts (to make the pupil understand the teaching) and enable the pupil to attain his object (become accomplished)[142].

कच्चिदेतच्छ्रुतं पार्थ त्वयैकाग्रेण चेतसा ।
कच्चिदज्ञानसंमोहः प्रनष्टस्ते धनंजय ॥ ७२ ॥

Kaccid-etacchṛtam Pārtha tvayaikāgreṇa cetasā
Kaccid-ajñāna-saṁmohaḥ pranaṣṭaste Dhanañjaya

72. Has this been heard by you, O Pārtha, with an attentive mind? Has the delusion of your ignorance been destroyed, O Dhanañjaya?

Has this, what I have told you, *been heard*, understood through hearing it, *by you, O Pārtha, with an attentive mind*, or have you been inadvertent? *Has the delusion of your ignorance*, the delusion, confusion of mind, absence of discrimination, which is caused by ignorance (ajñāna) and which is natural, *been destroyed, O Dhanañjaya*?,—it (the destruction of your delusion) having been the motive of all this exertion on your part to hear the Śāstra and of the exertion on My part as its Teacher.

अर्जुन उवाच—

नष्टो मोहः स्मृतिर्लब्धा त्वत्प्रसादान्मयाऽच्युत ।
स्थितोऽस्मि गतसन्देहः करिष्ये वचनं तव ॥ ७३ ॥

Arjuna uvāca—

Naṣṭo mohaḥ smṛtir-labdhā-tvat-prasādān-mayā(a)cyuta
Sthito(a)smi gata-sandehaḥ kariṣye vacanam tava

142. He should not become indifferent towards the pupil, who, owing to dullness of intellect, is unable to grasp what has already been taught. (Ā)

Arjuna said—

73. Destroyed is (my) delusion, and I have gained memory (remembrance; knowledge) through Thy Grace, O Acyuta .I am firm, with doubts gone. I will do Thy word.

Destroyed is (*my*) *delusion*, born of ignorance (ajñāna), the cause of the entire evil of saṁsāra, difficult to cross as the ocean, *and I have gained memory* (i.e, remembrance or knowledge) of the true nature of the Self, by the gain of which all the bonds of the hear tare loosened, *through Thy Grace* to me, who is dependent on Thy Grace, *O Acyuta*.

By this question and answer about the destruction of delusion, it is shown conclusively that the comprehension of the teaching of all Śāstra has this much purpose only, namely the destruction of the delusion of ignorance and attainment of the recognition of the Self. So also in the Śruti, beginning with the words, "Being ignorant of the Self, I grieve" (Ch.VII.i.3), it is stated that, on attaining to the Knowledge of the Self, all bonds are loosened (Ch.VII.xxvi.2); there are also the other Śruti texts: "The bond of the heart is broken" (Mu.II.ii.8) and the Mantra-varṇa, "To him who sees One-ness, what delusion is there, what grief?" (Īśa.7).

And now, *I am firm,* waiting for Thy command, *with doubts gone*, freed from uncertainty. *I will do thy word*:—by this Arjuna means to say: "Through Thy Grace, I have attained the supreme End of life; there is nothing for myself to do".

The Teaching of the (*Gītā*–) *Sastra* is over.

*

Now, in order to connect it with the main story (of the *Mahābhārata*), (Sañjaya says)—

सञ्जय उवाच —

इत्यहं वासुदेवस्य पार्थस्य च महात्मनः ।

संवादमिममश्रौषमद्भुतं रोमहर्षणम् ॥ ७४ ॥

Sañjaya uvāca—

Ityaham Vāsudevasya Pārthasya ca mahātmanaḥ
Samvādam-imam-aśrauṣam-adbhutam rama-harṣaṇam

Sañjaya said—

74. Thus have I heard this wonderful dialogue between Vāsudeva and the high-souled Pārtha, which causes the hair to stand on end.

Thus have I heard, learnt, *this,* as has been narrated, *wonderful,* extremely astonishing, *dialogue between Vāsudeva and the high-souled Pārtha, which causes the hair to stand on end,* produces the thrill of joy.

And that, in this way:

व्यासप्रसादाच्छ्रुतवानेतद्गुह्यमहं परम् ।
योगं योगेश्वरात्कृष्णात्साक्षात्कथयतः स्वयम् ॥ ७५ ॥

Vyāsa-prasādācchrutavān-etad-guhyam-aham param
Yogam Yogeśvarāt-Kṛṣṇāt-sākṣāt-kathayataḥ svayam

75. Through the grace of Vyāsa have I heard this supreme and most secret *Yoga*, direct from Kṛṣṇa, the Lord of *Yoga*, Himself declaring it.

Through the grace of Vyāsa, having obtained from him divine vision ("divya-cakṣus")[143], *have I heard this* dialogue, which is *supreme and most secret yoga:* this dialogue is called Yoga because it leads to Yoga[144], or this dialogue itself is Yoga[145],—*direct from*

143. vide note 1, Chap. I.

144. *Yoga* is two-fold, *jñāna-Yoga* and *Karma-Yoga*; and this dialogue leads to them (both). (Ā)

145. This dialogue is a means to *Yoga*, the concentration of the mind (*citta*) and therefore it is itself *Yoga*. (A)

Kṛṣṇa, the Lord of Yoga, Himself declaring it, and not through tradition (hearsay; transmitted from ear to ear).

राजन्संस्मृत्य संस्मृत्य संवादमिममद्भुतम् ।
केशवार्जुनयोः पुण्यं हृष्यामि च मुहुर्मुहुः ॥ ७६ ॥

Rājan saṁsmṛtya saṁsmṛtya saṁvādam-idam-adbhutam
Keśavārjunayoḥ puṇyam hṛṣyami ca muhur-muhuḥ

76. O King, repeatedly calling to mind this wonderful and holy dialogue between Keśava and Arjuna, I rejoice again and again.

O King, Dhṛtarāṣṭra, having heard *this wonderful and holy dialogue*—holy because, on being merely heard, it destroys sin—*between Keśava and Arjuna,* and then *calling* it *to mind repeatedly, I rejoice again and again,* at every moment.

तच्च संस्मृत्य संस्मृत्य रूपमत्यद्भुतं हरेः ।
विस्मयो मे महान्राजन्हृष्यामि च पुनः पुनः ॥ ७७ ॥

Tacca saṁsmṛtya saṁsmṛtya rūpam-atyadbhutam Hareḥ
Vismayo me mahān rājan hṛṣyāmi ca punaḥ punaḥ

77. And, repeatedly recalling to mind the most wonderful Form of Hari, great is my wonder, O King, and I rejoice again and again.

And, repeatedly recalling to mind the most wonderful Form, the Viśvarūpa (the Universal Form) *of Hari, great is my wonder, O King; and I rejoice again and again.*

Not to dilate further,

यत्र योगेश्वरः कृष्णो यत्र पार्थो धनुर्धरः ।
तत्र श्रीर्विजयो भूतिर्ध्रुवा नीतिर्मतिर्मम ॥ ७८ ॥

Yatra yogeśvaraḥ Kṛṣṇo yatra Pārtho dhanur dharaḥ
Tatra śrīr-vijayo bhūtir-dhruvā nītir-matir-mama

78. Wherever is Kṛṣṇa, the Lord of *Yoga*, wherever is Pārtha, the wielder of the bow, there are fortune, victory, prosperity, and sound policy; such is my conviction.

Wherever, on that side on which, *is Kṛṣṇa, the Lord of Yoga*,— He is the Lord of all Yogas, since the seed of all Yoga originates from Him[146];

Wherever, on that side on which, *is Pārtha, the wielder of the bow* called the Gāṇḍīva,

There, on that side, that of the Pāṇḍavas, *are fortune, victory, prosperity*, excellence and expanse of fortune, *and sound*, unfailing, *policy*, statesmenship;

Such is my conviction.

इति श्रीमहाभारते शतसाहस्र्यां संहितायां वैयासिक्यां
भीष्मपर्वणि श्रीमद्भगवद्गीतासूपनिषत्सु ब्रह्म-
विद्यायां योगशास्त्रे श्रीकृष्णार्जुन संवादे
मोक्षसंन्यासयोगो नाम
अष्टादशोऽध्यायः ॥
समाप्तिमगमदिदं गीता शास्त्रम् ॥

146. All *Yoga* i.e. both *Jñāna-yoga* and *Karma-yoga*, have for their seed discrimination (*jñāna*) and non-attachment (*vairāgya*), which arise from the *Śāstra*; and this (seed) depends on the Lord as it is impossible of attainment without His Grace. Therefore, since *Yoga* and its fruit are attainable only through the Lord's Grace, He is the Lord of *Yoga*. (Ā)

Iti Śri-Mahābhārate śata-sāhasryām saṁhitāyām Vaiyāsikyām Bhīṣma-Parvaṇi Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītāsūpaniṣatsu Brahma-vidyāyām Yoga-śāstre Śrī Kṛṣṇārjuna saṁvāde Mokṣa-saṁnyāsa Yogo nāma aṣṭādaśo(s)dhyāyaḥ.

Samāptim-agamad-idam Gītā-Śāstram

Thus, the eighteenth chapter entitled the 'Yoga of Liberation in Renunciation', in the Upaniṣads known as the Celebrated Songs of the Lord—expounding the Knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, and the Science of Yoga, in the form of a dialogue between Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna,— embodied in the Bhīṣma Parva of Śrī Mahābhārata, the Compendium of one hundred thousand verses produced by Vyāsa.

This Scripture of the Gītā reaches completion.

इति श्रीमत्परमहंसपरिव्राजकाचार्य गोविन्द भगवत्
पूज्यपादशिष्य श्रीमदाचार्य शंकर-
भगवतः कृतौ श्रीमद्भगवद्गीता-
भाष्यं संपूर्णम् ।

।। ॐ तत्सत ।।

Iti Śrīmat-parama-haṁsa-parivrājakācārya Govinda-Bhagavad-pūjyapāda-śiṣya Śrīmad-ācārya Śaṅkara-Bhagavataḥ kṛtau Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītā Bhāṣyam sampūrṇam

Thus the Commentary on Śrimad-Bhagavad-Gītā, among the works of the Master Śrimat-Śaṅkara-Bhagavān, pupil of the Worshipful and Venerable Master Srimat-Govinda-Bhagavān, of the order of Paramahaṁsa Saṁnyāsins.

OM TAT SAT

ERRAṬA

Page	*Line*	*Correct Reading*
50	26	उभौ
51	19	भूत्वाऽभविता
,,	23	bhūtvā(a)bhavitā
52	33	worldly
,,	35	Chap.I
53	10	पुरुषः
,,	22	delete 34
55	33	Vyāsa
56	7	worldly
,,	28; 31	Cūdāmaṇi
57	15	II. 21
,,	32	Scripture[42]
,,	35	pūrva - mīmāṁsaka who holds
59	14	मारुतः
61	19	mahābāho naivam
63	15-16	शृणोति श्रुत्वाप्येनं
,,	19-20	śṛṇoti śrutvāpyenam
64	10	देही
,,	23	II. 30
65	2	धर्म्याद्धि
,,	4	Dharmyāddhi
66	2	चेत्त्वमिमं
,,	28	kirāta
67	4-5	त्वां...लाघवम्
69	24	शृणु
,,	26-7	śṛṇu......prahāsyasi
71	14	बहुशाखा ह्यनन्ताश्च बुद्धयोऽव्यवसायिनाम्
73	28	worldly
74	1	samādhi=buddhi=

Page	*Line*	*Correct Reading*
74	27	constitutes the scripture of the awakened persons treading
,,	29	end in
75	18	४६
76	14	lower
,,	22	सङ्गो
77	18	सिद्ध्यसिद्ध्यो
,,	20	siddhyasiddhyo
78	9	दूरेण ह्यवरं
,,	13	śaraṇam
79	5-6	jahātīha....kauśalam
80	2	manīṣiṇaḥ
82	12	व्रजेत
85	6-7	(a man) *of steady* (established) *wisdom*
88	14-5	पुंसः सङ्ग...सङ्गात्सं...
,,	16	viṣayān-puṁsaḥ....teṣūpajāyate
89	1	Krodhād-bhavati
92	2	vāyur
94	23	(Scriptural)
98	15	śreyas=
100	7	knowledge associated
,,	32	delete, "Vide note 6 in Chapter II".
102	4	saṁnyāsin for non-worship
104	2	Jyāyasī
,,	21	productive of śreyas
105	7	undoubtedly
106	16	worldly
,,	31	Paramātma
111	last line	duty to
112	15	muktasaṅgaḥ
113	3	सह यज्ञाः
,,	16	भावयन्तु
,,	23	other gods
114	4-5	भोगान्हि...प्रदायैभ्यो

Page	*Line*	*Correct Reading*
114	7	Tair-
,,	16	senses
,,	last line	man is
115	17	Annād-bhavanti
117	13	Pṛthā
118	8	progeny
,,	22	man, the saṁnyāsin, the
119	25	asaktaḥ
120	11	संसिद्धिमास्थिता
,,	13	saṁsiddhimāsthitā
,,	22	saṁsiddhi=mokṣa
,,	last line	māhātmya
122	2	Nānavāptam-
,,	11	varteyam
,,	20	कुर्यां
,,	22	Utsīdeyur-ime
123	15-6	यथा...कुर्याद्वि...
124	6	Joṣayet-sarva-karmāṇi vidvān-
125	13	तत्त्ववित्तु
126	10	are thoroughly
,,	22-3	saṁnyasyādhyātma....nirmamo
128	4	jñāna
,,	8	to) ,
,,	10	deluded in,
,,	18	भूतानि
129	11	परिपन्थिनौ
131	last line	महाशनो...विद्ध्येनमिह
132	14	six (properties)
133	2	तेनेदमावृतम्
,,	3	vanhir-yathādarśo
134	21	prajahi hyenam jñāna-vijñana
135	6	to)
,,	14	...रिन्द्रियेभ्यः

Page	*Line*	*Correct Reading*
135	24	subtlety
138	3 (Heading)	CATURTHO(A)DHYĀYAH
,,	10-11	...मव्ययम् ।...प्राह मनु...
139	24	foes
140	17	भवतो
141	14	Tanyaham
144	14	My Being
,,	21	fire)—
157	20-21	He, who having commenced performing action, subsequently acquires
159	4	Śarīram
,,	16	undesirable
162	16	result (' agra'—
168	17-8	tapo-yajñā yoga-yajñās-tathā(a)pare Svādhyāya-jñāna-yajñāśca
169	6	प्राणेऽपानं
,,	15	outgoing breath into
172	29	service. The
174	21	Jñānāgniḥ sarva-karmāṇi
176	23	called liberation
,,	31	Cūḍāmaṇi, 25
177	22	nibadhnanti
178	6	bound
,,	10	nuṣṭhāna
,,	31	(repelled)
,,	32	about
181	37	renunciation
184	15	passages
185	6	originally
186	4	etayor-ekam
,,	7	(karma) yoga.
187	10	kāṅkṣati
188	1	पृथग्बालाः
,,	5	saṁyag
191	20	गृह्...

Page	*Line*	*Correct Reading*
193	10	सङ्गं
198	23	Tad-buddhayas-tad
200	13	Brahmaṇi
201	25	नोद्विजेत्प्राप्य
209	16	and the witness of all cognitions
211	4	Knowledge
212	2, 4, 15	Yoga [for "yoka"]
214	8	yogi
221	9	duḥkheṣu
227	27	Yuktāhāra.....karmasu
234	28	aikarasya
237	19	yogas-tvayā
240	21	possessed
241	10	(the path of Dhyāna-Yoga)
,,	26	पार्थ
252	4	सर्वाणी...
254	21	Bījam
255	27	rājasās-
256	19	nābhijānāti
258	23	jñānino....
267	2	...कालेऽपि
274	14	कविं
275	6	भक्त्या
,,	8	Prayāṇa
277	19	taught
,,	20	(yoga-dhāraṇā)
278	1	knowledge
279	16	महात्मानः
282	29	makes
283	-2	सर्वेषु
284	1	Unmanifested
285	27-28	dhyāna-yogins

Page	*Line*	*Correct Reading*
286	20	Brahman
289	last two lines	Brahmākṣara-nirdeśaḥ ("Instruction about the Imperishable Brahman").
290	4 (Heading)	VIDYĀ
,,	7	setting aside
293	1	Aśraddhadhānāḥ
,,	22-4	avyakta-mūrtinā....bhūtāni
295	13, 26	bhūtāni
297	18	IX [for "XI"]
299	20	Rākṣasīm....śritāḥ
300	13-4	āśritāh Bhajantyananya
302	10	...ऽहमहमौषधम्
304	6	...युत्सृजामि
305	18	and
306	4	विशन्ति
312	11	stay away
320	4	for-
321	17	तत्त्वतः
323	1	मच्चित्ता
,,	19	प्रीति...
326	last line	nirupādhika
328	15	तृप्तिर्हि
333	23	foremost
334	20	yield-
,,	last line	Bhāgavata
335	20	Vinatā
,,	24	Rāmaḥ
336	26	Adhyātma-vidyā
,,	27	(pariṇati)
,,	28	(antaḥ-karaṇa)
337	12	samāsa" am I
338	27	साम्नां
339	8	द्यूतं
,,	28	irresistible

Page	*Line*	*Correct Reading*
341	26	तेजोंश
342	10	Jñātena
,,	23	prosperity
344	3 (Heading)	EKĀDAŚO....
345	4	श्रुतौ
347	18	यच्चान्यद्-द्रष्टु...
348	7	द्रष्टुमनेनै व
,,	24	पार्थाय
349	9	Dhṛtarāṣṭra!
,,	12	Universal
350	13	All-wonderful
,,	15	His
351	7	तत्रैकस्थं
353	17	दीप्तानलार्कद्युति...
354	21	विश्वमिदं
357	17	bahu-bāhūru
359	9	तथाऽसौ
360	last line	तथैव
363	10	मयैवैते
368	11	praises
369	6	punaśca bhūyo(a)pi
370	19	pramādāt
371	7	vihāra-
372	4	the three worlds
375	27	as that of
377	13	mien
378	10	दृष्टवानसि
379	14	प्रवेष्टुं च
,,	19	may be
380	6	saṅga-
383	11	think of Thee

Page	*Line*	*Correct Reading*
383	27	3 to 5 and 13 to 20)
385	35	presumption
386	2	प्राप्नुवन्ति
390	16	esteemed
395	3	kaṅkṣati
401	35	kṣetrajña)
407	4	Objection
409	8	"Devadatta, do this"
420	28	prakṛtiravikṛtiḥ
421	9	know-
,,	11	karaṇa)
423	11	birth,
424	4	aṅgaḥ
,,	17	wives
425	9	sole
427	9	Anādimat-Param
428	33	(Power)
434	24	the bodies
436	18	(Gītā)
441	35	saṁsāra
442	9	bhuṅkte
,,	27	apprehension. . . pleasure or
447	25	dawn
448	1	taught
,,	26	dveṣa
452	2	...संयोगा...
454	last line	Chap.II
456	3	126 [for "216"]
459	27-9	has been. . . . (Jainas)
460	5	Paramahaṁsa-
468	11	And it
470	24	तमः सत्त्वं
473	2-3	by the Guṇas alone
474	7	duḥkham
476	24	दुःखै...